Where did the Communist Party Go?

A critique of
The Communist Party and
Revolutionary Communist Youth

By the former RKU-Uppsala
Sweden, January 2019

Table of contents

Introduction and translator's notes. 3

Definitions 5

The Executive Committee: A paper tiger with organizational teeth 8

Speech is silver, silence is golden 33

Oppression is freedom. Repression is safety. 40

The Communist Party and the election of 2018 50

The corruption of anti-imperialist thought 65

Social chauvinism 73

It is wrong to rebel! 89

Closing remarks 99

Introduction and translator's notes.

For the Swedish Revolutionary Communist Youth, the year 2018 was a year of internal struggle against right wing opportunism and revisionism. The Communist Party in Sweden (K) embraced even more than before an opportunist line that included blatant racism and reformism. Seeing the reactionary right party the Sweden Democrats grow to become the third biggest party in the Swedish parliament, the Communist Party in Sweden adapted to the reactionary policies of the Sweden Democrats. Rebranding it a *"revolutionary"* and *"socialist"* lines.

In Revolutionary Communist Youth (RKU) this line was met with different responses. Some within the youth wing embraced this opportunism, while others rejected the reactionary line of the Communist Party in Sweden. The members of Revolutionary Communist Youths Uppsala branch started to criticize the party and the youth organisation while pushing for an anti-revisionist and revolutionary line. This was met with fierce opposition from the Executive Committee who wanted to silence our branch.

This criticism is the result of a long period of reflection and study, much longer than the time we've been outside of RKU. The enormous problems of the movement we now have left have been apparent to us for years; this is our attempt to synthesize years of discussions and criticism to a thorough polemic that exposes the enormous problems of the communist movement in Sweden. Only by breaking with the old can we start building the new.

Translator's notes

This translation is intended to serve several purposes. On one hand, it makes it easier for comrades not fluent in the Swedish language (in written or spoken form) to be made aware of the revisionist path of the Communist party and RKU. It also makes our polemic available to large sections of the international communist movement. Different organisations who has relations with the Communist party in Sweden, need to be aware of the positions the Communist Party propagates in Sweden, and there is also the possibility to learn from Swedish experiences of revisionism. We hope by this to further the understanding of how we fight it.

Now more than ever, it is paramount to study revisionism. To understand it as the cancer it is for the communist movement. When so many nations lack revolutionary communist parties and when the movement to reconstitute them under a revolutionary line is in upsurge. We therefore present this as a case study of how to *not* be a revolutionary organisation. We quote directly from both internal and external statements by the Communist party and RKU. While lacking the time and effort to actually fully translate the source material, the quotes are translated and are not intended to be taken out of context. We've therefore also, primarily for the international readers, included translators' notes with context for specific things that may not be internationally known.

Definitions

(the) **Communist Party** (“Kommunistiska partiet”) alternatively **K**
One of two communist parties in Sweden. Earlier, the party went under the name “The Communist Party Marxist-Leninists (revolutionaries)”, for which the Swedish acronym is KPML(r). They were formed as a splinter group from the revisionist KFML in the 1970’s.
When noted as “K-(location)”, it refers to a local section within K.

Revolutionary Communist Youth (“Revolutionär kommunistisk ungdom”) alternatively **RKU**
K’s youth wing. Founded in 1994 as a replacement for the Communist Party’s earlier youth wing, dissolved in 1979.
When noted as “RKU-(location)”, it refers to a local section within RKU.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party (“Partistyrelsen”)
The highest governing body within K (and RKU, apparently) between congresses.

The Central Committee of RKU (“Centralstyrelsen”)
A number of representatives elected by the congress, which primary objective is to be the highest political, organizational and ideological leadership of RKU. The highest governing body with RKU between congresses.

The Executive Committee (“Arbetsutskottet”)
A number of representatives chosen from the ranks of the central committee of RKU to make sure that work continues steadily. The highest governing body between meetings of the central committee of RKU.

Revolutionären
Translates to *The Revolutionary*. A journal, published internally for the members of RKU, to conduct debate and discussions in.

CS-Bladet
Translates to *CS-News* ("bladet" literally translates to "sheet", but is a common suffix for newspapers to have in Sweden.). A journal published internally for the members of the central committee of RKU.

Proletären
Translates to *The Proletarian*. A newspaper published by K.

Klasskampen
Translates to *The Class Struggle*. A journal published internally for the members of K.

District conference ("Distriktskonferens")
A meeting between local organisations in RKU.

There are four *districts* in RKU:

The Eastern district. Covers the eastern corner of Sweden. Traditionally this district has been made up of the counties and regions around Sweden's capital Stockholm. In 2018 the membership organizations of the eastern district consisted of: RKU-Stockholm, RKU-Uppsala, RKU-Norrköping.

The Northern district. The largest district, covering over two thirds of Sweden. Because of the history of the communist movement in Sweden, this has been the Communist Party's and RKU:s weakest district. In 2018 the membership organizations consisted of: RKU-Sundsvall, RKU-Umeå.

The Southern district. The smallest district, consisting only of one region of Sweden, Skåne. In 2018 the membership organizations consisted of: RKU-Kristianstad, RKU-Malmö, RKU-Helsingborg.

The western district. Confusingly named (the majority of the districts area consists of Småland, a region of Sweden that is on the *eastern* side of the country) but generally seen as "the heart" of RKU. In 2018 the membership organizations

consisted of: RKU-Göteborg, RKU-Karlstad, RKU-Halmstad, RKU-Jönköping, RKU-Växjö.

The Executive Committee: A paper tiger with organizational teeth

On December 20th, 2018, RKU-Uppsala received an email from the general secretary of RKU Arvid Gustafsson, representing the Executive Committee. The message came after an exchange of words that RKU-Uppsala had with the Uppsala section of the Communist Party, where RKU-Uppsala had excluded K-Uppsala from a manifestation against the new government budget, with the following reasoning:

> *"K, having taken a forceful stance for the strengthening of the police, for the strengthening of border controls, and for a restrictive approach towards asylum seekers, have now been branded as a racist party among the organisations we are seeking to cooperate with. We can't object to this. The policies that K advocate have racist effects, and is to us counter-revolutionary and not based in reality.*
> *Our standing, that we have fought dearly for, against the current, will be ruined if we submit to K's will. We will never be able to attract youths to a movement that is viewed as reactionary and racist. Thus, this places us in an impossible situation. We have not written this in anger, but as a statement on our current analysis of the situation. The policies you advocate are so vastly separated from ours, that us letting you through will mean enormous losses for us without any gain."*

This was answered by the chairman of K-Uppsala, John Dolve. As noted in earlier attempts to criticise the party's local section, all attempts at rational debate were dismissed categorically, without any consideration or reflection. Dolve instead accused RKU-Uppsala of having a "everything I don't like is racism"-line of thinking. The enormous feats of mental gymnastics that serves as the foundation for their empirically invalid stance will be discussed later. But for now, it is important to take note of the end of the mail reply sent by the chairman:

"*There are many comrades that want you thrown out, both from the party quarters and the organisation (RKU). I have urged calm and reflection, and if possible reconciliation, but this will not pass unnoticed, because this is about so much more than just having an official representative at a meeting. What are your motives really, and in what light do you think we (the Communist Party) will see RKU-Uppsala after this?*"

Translator's note:
The muzzle statue, or "munkorgestadgan", is a reference to when the Swedish social democratic party split with its youth organisation, back in 1917.

In a statement like this, an historical echo of traditional Social Democratic betrayal can be heard. From the times of the muzzle statue that is over 100 years old by now. This does not reflect a comradely relation of criticism and self-criticism between the sections, but instead represents a kind of patriarchal leadership by the party. RKU should never become too argumentative, but should instead bend over on the party's whim. Political divisions within the movement, different opinions and approaches aren't seen as means of strengthening, developing or making our political views clearer. They immediately become an existential threat and is seen as going against communist discipline.

We can only refer to that revolutionary discipline is at its strongest when self-mandated and self-applied. Lenin writes in *"What is to be done?"* that discipline is something that can't be established from above and *must* come from below, from the grassroots of the movement. There is no going against revolutionary discipline in demanding clarity from the movement. Demanding that the movement actually *be* what it claims to be: revolutionary. The leadership of the Communist Party and RKU instead think that the meaning of discipline can be derived from old East German hymns, that discipline means that *the party is always right*. The leadership is unquestionable and infallible. The party line should not be derived from the programme but from the leadership's interpretation thereof. The leadership is always right. All criticism is an attack on the organisation itself, and must be crushed. There is an expression for this: *cadaver discipline*. The party should not consist of people able to think for themselves; the party should only consist of people able to follow orders.

The threat to exclude and ostracize RKU-Uppsala was seen as an empty one (by us). In statue §2.2 in the Revolutionary Communist Youth by-laws, ratified by the thirteenth congress during May 2017, we can read as follows: *RKU is a sovereign organisation, founded upon the stances and politics of the Communist Party*. This expressed, according to us, a clear right for us, the right to deny the Communist Party participation in this single instance, as well as preventing from the Communist Party in meddling in RKU's internal affairs.

The branch committee of RKU-Uppsala decided, after discussing with the members, to leave the party quarters in Uppsala, as a response to their "threat" to expel us. What was planned to follow were a series of thorough discussions between equals to solve the contradictions. That evening, a 9 pages long reply to K-Uppsala was written, deepening and explaining our analysis. Sadly, this reply was never sent - because the day after, the General Secretary of RKU, Arvid Gustafsson, sent the email we mentioned earlier. Representing the executive committee, he wrote:

> *Comrades,*
>
> *As I just explained to Oliver, we look at what has happened seriously. To, in an email exchange with the local party section, denounce the party as counterrevolutionaries, reactionaries and racists is condemnable in mainly two ways. RKU is the youth organisation of the Communist Party. Despite our autonomy, our relationship with K is very important for both our organisations. This is regulated in our statues, in §2.*
>
> *Furthermore, it is serious (translator's note: meant in a bad way, to mark importance) to present this line from a local organisation in this way, as it goes against our democratic principles which lay clear that our association is organised according to "freedom in discussion, unity in action", something which has now been broken. The youth wing's stance towards K is something that you can't decide yourselves, especially as it is such an important part of our continued existence. Something you've also failed to do repeatedly is to contact us centrally directly (translator's note: as in sending a message to the executive committee), to try to solve these*

problems together. As we see it, RKU-Uppsala are navigating outside the youth wing's waters and creating their own reality.

As said before, we in the executive committee of the central committee of RKU view this matter very gravely, and we suggest that you back down from your statements and apologize to both the local party section as well as the party central, or we in the executive committee will work to dissolve RKU-Uppsala and exclude Oliver Carlberg from the central committee of RKU.
I count on you keeping this between yourselves for the time being.
Comradely,
Arvid Gustafsson, for the Executive Committee
(Email sent from general secretary Arvid Gustafsson, representing the Executive Committee of RKU, sent to RKU-Uppsala. 20/12-2018)

The empty threats that K-Uppsala made were not empty, after all. Once again, with this mail, RKU is exposed like the top-managed organisation that it really is. The statement made here must be broken down into pieces. But to do that, some context is required. The EC of RKU was in no way unaware of the strained relationship between the party and the youth wing in Uppsala. Their inaction reflects on their incompetence, not their unawareness. Ironically as well, this threat, this ultimatum was made without any communication with the central committee of RKU! Something that the executive committee has the *formal* right to do. In statue §6, part b) 3) the following can be read:

"The Central Committee of RKU elects a chairman and a treasurer for the federation, as well as an executive committee consisting of at least three members, chosen amongst their ranks. The executive committee shall exercise the duties of the committee between meetings. Between meeting the executive committee is the highest authority in the organisation."

But the executive committee's actions robbed the rest of the central committee of the right to act as the foremost leadership of RKU, as an ultimatum had already been given. In this case, the central committee is only a rubber stamp, and the real power is placed in the hands of EC. But even the party-loyal clique in

EC were spared from having to think for themselves. In CS-Bladet #16 2018, the renegade Gustafsson writes the following in an article called “About RKU-Uppsala”:

> *“Around lunchtime this wednesday (19/12) we received an email from Pär Johansson (General Secretary of the Communist Party, translator’s note) regarding RKU-Uppsala and their relationship to their local party section and the party as a whole.*
>
> *We in the executive committee discussed this during all of Wednesday, after we got the email from the executive committee of the Communist Party. The executive committee of the party were of the opinion that the only right thing to do would be to dissolve the local section and exclude Oliver Carlberg from the central committee of RKU. Formally, such a decision could be taken by us in the executive committee alone. But after discussing the matter we are inclined to believe that such a decision must be taken by the central committee.*
>
> *We also think that an exclusion like this can have consequences for the youth wing as a whole. We want to avoid creating sympathies for Uppsala because of the executive committee of the central committee rushing to a decision, and that is why we chose to give RKU-Uppsala another chance.”*

So this is an order from the Communist Party, signed Pär Johansson and the executive committee of the party. It is important to note that the executive committee of RKU isn’t acting on behalf of RKU in this matter, but are merely running the party’s errands. With this unearthed, we move on to addressing the charges brought against us.

1. That RKU-Uppsala acted contrary to statute §2.2

To us, this is an absurd claim. The statue is, in ways, self-contradicting. A sovereign organization can’t be subordinated to another’s policies and stances. That would violate its sovereignty. But the statue may very well be crafted the way it is to allow

the executive committee to interpret it in a way favourable to it. Let us quote several members of the executive committee and see how their current interpretation hold up:

> *"In our statues, we recognize the Communist Party as our mother party and explain that we are founded on the policies of the Communist Party. To, in a question of a political detail, in an email, say that our party is something we cannot work with because of them being reactionary racists and counter-revolutionaries is one one hand against statue §2.1, as one openly declares that one does not see the Communist Party as one's party and does not desire to cooperate with them because other organisations don't want to."* (Arvid Gustafsson. *CS-bladet* #16 2018)

> *"As for these political discussions, it is not those aspects that are relevant. No one denies that there are such contradictions within the party. But that is another discussion.* ***The party is the party, we are RKU****.* (text bolded by us, translator's note)*"* (Andreas Köhler. Member of the executive committee, commenting on *CS-bladet* 16 20:39 20/12)

> *"From what you can see in the email it seems that they don't see the party as a partner to cooperate with at all, thus it's not about this one single manifestation. "* (Arvid Gustafsson. Member of the executive committee, commenting on CS-bladet 16 11:28 21/12)

> *"[...] the email exchange with K-Uppsala is written in such a way that K-Uppsala is a stand-alone organisation, [...]"* (Arvid Gustafsson. Member of the executive committee, commenting on CS-bladet 16 16:25 21/12)

So how would they have it, really? What stance does the executive committee take? Is the party the party and is RKU, RKU? Two separate, but equal organisations. Is K-Uppsala stand-alone, but not the other local sections? Or is RKU eternally bound in a sort of patriarchal relation with K, where K's word is RKU's law?

The only interpretation that is consistent through and through is that for the executive committee, RKU is both sovereign and a subject to K. It seems that it all depends on how the rules can be used to silence criticism. In this case, RKU-Uppsala's criticism. The fact that the executive committee uses the Communist Party being stand-alone to prove that the principle about unity in action has been violated, but at the same time they argue that we are subject to and dependent on their policies and statements, is confusing. It only proves to us that the executive committee is nothing but unprincipled, hypocritical puppets to the revisionist Communist Party, bending whatever way needed.

2. Violating unity in action

The notion that we have violated the principle of unity is as absurd as the other accusation. The executive committee may, and should, tell us who it is that violates unity when RKU in their program of action states that they shall *"Protect the right to asylum!"* and the Communist Party, in their party platform states that *"Sweden should be a sanctuary."*. Is it then not violating the principle of outwards unity, to allow publications like these to be published under the name of the Communist Party (and by the reasoning of the executive committee, RKU's name as well)?

> *"Only police action is not enough*
> *The wave of shootings in Uppsala continue. 13 shootings so far in 2018 prove that the criminal gangs have not been hindered, as promised in 2017 by the police when they started operation Linsen in Gottsunda [a suburb of Uppsala, translator's note]. The criminals have moved their activity to Gränby [another suburb, translator's notes] and surroundings. Nine shootings in this area during this year, during the same week a man was killed on Levertin street and one one Heidenstam's square. The city's police chief, Per Halldén states to Radio Uppland that Uppsala, and the greater Uppland region have never been so exposed to narcotics and weapons coming from the rest of Europe. Reality shows that large-scale police operations like Linsen aren't sufficient, the question is if it is the right way.* ***Reality shows that harsher border checks are needed*** (bolded by us, translator's note)*, as well as social policies with employment, housing and social safety as a foundation to fight crime. " (Kommunistiska Partiet*

Uppsala. facebook.com/kpuppsala/ 23 november kl. 14:52 [Fetched 03:52 22/12])

Statements like these can *never* be separated from their racist nature. There are no reasons to believe that harsher border controls strike at anyone else but refugees. During the last three years, we have witnessed the persecution of undocumented immigrants, we have witnessed immigrants facing a harsher labour market (where slave-like conditions can be enforced through the withholding of passports). We couldn't care less whether the members of K-Uppsala see themselves as racists or not. What's interesting here is that they, because of their statements, are seen as such. We have a choice here - stand with K, or denounce K. unity in action, or violating our own program. RKU doesn't want harsher border checks, and as far as we in the former RKU-Uppsala know, have never wanted that.

Furthermore, this is not the first time such actions are committed by the executive committee. During the months before the election (which was held in September 2018), RKU had a national campaign, which called for youths to organize. We in RKU-Uppsala chose to give the campaign a "fuck the election"-twist on top of the original message, as K-Uppsala didn't partake in the local election. The first thing we did that garnered more attention than normal was to put up posters on top of the established parties' election posters. We did this on a number of different parties posters: The Christian Democrats (KD), The Green Party (MP) and The Left Party (V). This sparked the interest of the local newspaper, which wrote about it in an article. After said article, we were contacted by the executive committee. They gave us an ultimatum, where the choices were as follows: Remove all mention of the action from your social media profiles, or be publicly denounced by RKU, that is *actually breaking unity in action*. That time, we abided - we thought that it was just a clumsy move by the executive committee, and that it

Translator's note: Some context. The important one here is V, or *Vänsterpartiet* (the left party), which is the remnants of the old communist movement in Sweden (but have since erased all traces of marxist language from their platform and are purely reformist). Some local sections of K and RKU cooperate with local sections of V.

would be the wrong hill to die on. The following text is an article meant to be published in *Revolutionären* (the internal debate journal). It was never sent:

> *"During the past 'Organize!' campaign, RKU-Uppsala worked with this (for us communists) commonplace slogan to take it to the next logical level. The conclusion RKU-Uppsala came to, because of K-Uppsala not participating in the local election, was to give the campaign a "fuck the election" perspective. This was meant to differentiate us from the reformist Left Youth (Ung Vänster) and make it clear that various anarchist movements, such as Everything to Everyone (Allt åt alla) and the Syndicalist Youth Federation (Syndikalistiska Ungdomsförbundet) haven't patented more "direct action" types of methods. We therefore chose to sabotage a number of election campaign posters for KD, MP and V, in order to attack their bourgeois lies.*
>
> **Translator's note:** Ung Vänster is the youth organisation of Vänsterpartiet, and are equally reformist.
>
> *On top of these tactical points of view, we also thought that this was a quick, easy and effective way to communicate a communist's view on the bourgeois election process: that it is a charade and that we, members of the working class, will never see real change through it.*
>
> *The response to our posts* (on Facebook and Instagram, translator's note) *were mixed, and strongly worded. Overall, we in RKU-Uppsala can state that the action weren't seen as controversial until the local newspaper wrote about it, something that we acknowledged. After that, shit hit the fan. From being a small action that surely would have disappeared in the noise from the ongoing election campaigns, but still would've served its purpose for the local section of our organisation, the reactions to our vandalising was blown up to cataclysmic proportions. One RKU-sections small and harmless sabotage got reactions worthy of a car bomb!*

RKU-Uppsala was then contacted by the executive committee of the central committee of RKU, who demanded an immediate takedown of all posts mentioning the action from RKU-Uppsala's social media. The threat behind this demand was our dissolution. We complied, as we didn't have any choice. We never broke any of our statues, or did anything really 'wrong', but the response from the executive committee made it clear that we could either follow their lead, or be branded as personae non grata.

The kind of behaviour that the executive committee showed here is not acceptable. A whole branch was denied the right to debate and defend its actions, without being given any reason. Threatened to silence. The effects of such an uncomradely and undemocratic action is, of course, devastating to our members' engagement in our organisation and its policymaking. That kind of top-to-bottom management has no place in a revolutionary movement. We have our discipline, sure, but that discipline is not a military cadavre discipline where the leadership can direct and give orders free from criticism.

On top of these internal reactions, two extremely passive-aggressive posts were published on Facebook by the Communist Party's local sections from Karlstad and Malmö. We have, from K-Karlstads chairman Anders Wiklund, received confirmation that their post was directed at us in RKU-Uppsala, which is immature, uncomradely, and silly behaviour. Instead of direct, open and honest discussion, members of the Communist Party , and even whole local organisations, rely on passive-aggressive posts, backbiting and breaking the principle of outwards unity. This immature behaviour had no consequences and the posts are, to this day, up for public viewing - even though RKU-Uppsala demanded that K-Karlstad removed their posts as a sort of quid pro quo.

Erik Kalantar, a member of RKU-Uppsala, received the following answer from chairman Anders Wiklund:

"Hi! I thought I should make some things clear about the latest post from Karlstad. I should, of course, have talked to you before publishing the post. I apologize for not thinking about that. In Karlstad, multiple parties (the Sweden Democrats [right-wing nationalist party, translator's note] seems to be the worst affected) have noticed sabotage of, mainly, election posters. Since we had some problems with local RKU members vandalizing posters during the last election campaign, and to make clear the communist strategy for the election for our antagonists (we don't want to be falsely accused), we chose to publish the post about the Social Democrats' ruined posters. But it is also due to your actions. We saw that some RKU members from Karlstad had liked the post on Facebook, and felt like we should talk to them as well. If our local youth organisation here in Karlstad should act in a similar way, it would have devastating effects on our campaign. The post was targeted at a local problem, and to our own youths that we don't think understand that we don't work with these kinds of methods.

Have a nice evening!"

We have to start by asking: Are RKU-Karlstad aware of that this is what K-Karlstad think of them? Are they aware that K-Karlstad are behaving like some kind of thought police, deciding what RKU members are and aren't allowed to like on the internet? RKU-Uppsala doesn't appreciate that the communication between the two organisations is made up of facebook posts. This entire situation is badly managed by the executive committees of both RKU and the party. That members of the Communist Party are behaving badly on the internet is nothing new, but that it has gone so far as to use official propaganda channels to give a RKU-section a kick in the ass, is to us not only immature and lame, it is absurd. We once again demand that these posts are removed in order for us to have any faith left that the party take accusations of repeated indignities towards members of RKU seriously.

Furthermore, we must reflect on the meaning of this response. The only ones who were truly offended by this were a select few members of the Left Party Uppsala, but mainly (on a national level, excluding K-Uppsala), the Communist Party. Why? It is said that the actions taken by RKU-Uppsala can harm relationships with the Left Party all around the country. Prove this! Where is the evidence for this having such a harmful effect? Also - are we supposed to orient our praxis around establishing closer relationships with the Left Party and Left Youth? While broad co-operations can be helpful, they should never serve as the main goal itself!

The critique we have received - that this hampers the ability of other K sections to continue with their election campaigns - also is an expression of two strong deviations to the right. Firstly, it is highly legalist to think that we shouldn't dabble with sabotage because of "us not working with these kinds of methods" - a communist not prepared to throw wrenches into the machinery that is the state is a communist who makes a "sacred cow" out of bourgeois legality, and will neuter a revolutionary movement. Never in the history of the world will a revolution be performed within the framework of the bourgeoisie. Secondly, it is most revisionist to try to "widen your perspective" in order to get more votes by toning down revolutionary ideas and praxis - isn't the election supposed to be a measuring tool, with which we can see how class conscious the working masses are? Or has K made it an end in itself to partake in municipal rule, thus leaving the path that all revolutionaries must take? The election not being an end in itself is something that we in RKU have said time and time again, so many times that it has almost become boring - that is how agreed we are in this regard. Then, why this response? Why this response to an action that clearly demonstrates that we exist outside the boundaries of bourgeois society?

To mutilate our theory again and again, to tone ourselves down, to push our revolutionary ideals aside, that is to castrate the communist movement, leaving it impotent. If you are so desperate to please The Left Party , we have a simple solution - join them! We won't approve of this

kind of reasoning without proper evidence being laid out, instead we see this as a form of corrupt top-management where you "solve" ideological contradictions by administrative means.

Lastly, we ask: what does the executive committee want, with the actions it has taken? Does the executive committee desire the dissolution of RKU-Uppsala, does it want our members to leave the movement? That is the extremity in which the actions taken will result. An undemocratic, top-managed and silencing communist movement is a dead communist movement - something we will never allow."

This article, written during the fall of 2018, is oddly prophetic to look back on now. RKU is part of an undemocratic, top-managed and silencing communist movement. RKU is part of a dead communist movement and has under the guidance of the executive committee and the Communist Party taken a dark turn onto the path of irredeemable revisionism.

Having said this, we should not fool ourselves and think that this is the end of the executive committee's ventures. For if there is something that the executive committee of RKU excels at, it is to, in a truly bureaucratic spirit, exercise too much centralism. And to constrain internal democracy until it is nothing more than a formality. In preparation for 2019, a "Crisis-campaign" was to be held. This was of course discussed before any decision was taken. A suggestion arose to make a brochure looking like the crisis preparation pamphlet published by the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency. As this suggestion was both cringe-inducing and embarrassing, it met considerable resistance during the district conference held by the northern and eastern districts of RKU. There, a counter-suggestion was made to instead put a parody of the pamphlet cover on top of *Rebell*, the public journal published by RKU.

The problem with the criticism raised by the district conference was that is was subjective in nature, and mainly concerned the aesthetical questions, while it failed to cover the content of the brochure itself in a thorough way. The discussion around the suggestion can be boiled down to "is it really funny to copy MSB?" (the Swedish Civil Contingencies Agency, translator's note). Frederik Wilcek, member of

the central committee of RKU, in an address written by him (with help from the executive committee member and renegate Andreas Köhler) summarizs the contents of the brochure like this:

> *“After this summer, and with the current political climate, there is a sense of looming doom throughout society. Many are talking about the collapse of society, the climate crisis and about our lack of preparedness. Here, we want to enter the scene with our own revolutionary propaganda.”*
> (Protocol from the district conference of RKU’s northern and eastern districts’ conference 15/9 2018)

Earlier, a series of “crises” are mentioned, and while this is somewhat thorough, there is no empirical data to refer to, and thus the only question becomes “What can we bring up, that is relevant, about preparedness in relation to capitalism?”, an extremely vague task. Without data to refer to, there can be no deep discussion and analysis. Mao teaches us the following:

> “*In studying a problem, we must shun subjectivity, one-sidedness and superficiality. To be subjective means not to look at problems objectively, that is, not to use the materialist viewpoint in looking at problems. I have discussed this in my essay "On Practice". To be one-sided means not to look at problems all-sidedly.*
>
> *...*
>
> *Or it may be called seeing the part but not the whole, seeing the trees but not the forest. That way it is impossible to find the method for resolving a contradiction, it is impossible to accomplish the tasks of the revolution, to carry out assignments well or to develop inner-Party ideological struggle correctly. When Sun Wu Tzu said in discussing military science, "Know the enemy and know yourself, and you can fight a hundred battles with no danger of defeat", he was referring to the two sides in a battle. Wei Cheng of the Tang Dynasty also understood the error of one-sidedness when he said, "Listen to both sides and you will be enlightened, heed only one side and you will be benighted." But our comrades often look at problems one-sidedly, and so they often run into snags.*

...

Lenin said: ... in order really to know an object we must embrace, study, all its sides, all connections and "mediations". We shall never achieve this completely, but the demand for all-sidedness is a safeguard against mistakes and rigidity.

We should remember his words. To be superficial means to consider neither the characteristics of a contradiction in its totality nor the characteristics of each of its aspects; it means to deny the necessity for probing deeply into a thing and minutely studying the characteristics of its contradiction, but instead merely to look from afar and, after glimpsing the rough outline, immediately to try to resolve the contradiction (to answer a question, settle a dispute, handle work, or direct a military operation). This way of doing things is bound to lead to trouble.

...

To be one-sided and superficial is at the same time to be subjective. For all objective things are actually interconnected and are governed by inner laws, but, instead of undertaking the task of reflecting things as they really are, some people only look at things one-sidedly or superficially and know neither their interconnections nor their inner laws, and so their method is subjectivist." (*Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung*, chapter "Methods of Thinking and Methods of Work")

In this regard, the executive committee tied our hands behind our backs, forcing the discussions held during the district conferences to be shallow, and thus worthless for our political work. Though one can ask themselves if the criticism of the brochure-paraphrasing-idea was even heard at all. Many voices were raised against the brochure, suggesting that it belonged as a cover of *Rebell* instead. In spite of all this, the EC went through with the idea.

The brochure was then presented before the central committee of RKU. The central committee then had about a day's time to criticise the brochure before it was sent for print. From the executive committee's point of view, this makes perfect sense - everyone in the central committee aren't renegades who had the opportunity to take part in the making of the flyer, after all. But the other members

of the CC have jobs to do and have to attend school and various other duties, and thus would never had the time to raise any criticism about the brochure.

The contents of the brochure are of an especially banal, vague and opportunistic kind. It mentions the climate crisis, but we have to ask ourselves if wouldn't be better for the climate not to waste paper on this brochure. Not once does the brochure mention revolution, instead it avoids the subject with wordings like *"It's time for something different now.", "RKU takes the fight for a socialist society[...]",* and *"It is time that we, together, fight for change"*. This is anything but concrete, and anyone who reads this might very well interpret - and rightly - RKU as a reformist organisation. There's no notion of revolutionary content here.

Usually the flyer uses the stale structure of "X is a problem caused by capitalism, to solve it we need socialism which we can only get by revolution. Join RKU!" This in no way explains *how* we should go about *making a revolution*.

It seems that the right-wing opportunists have some kind of primal fear or unwillingness to touch this our most important point. Instead, the question raised is one of us all cooperating to change society - which would be fine, if it only once mentioned how we wish to accomplish this. Pure reformism, essentially - and it springs from the renegades lack of trust in the masses.

The bullet list contained within the brochure summarizes this perfectly. It is a pure cavalcade of reformist and confused attempts at agitation:

- Join the union along with your colleagues and organise for better conditions at your workplace.
- Organise with your neighbours and fight for local issues.
- Demand free public transport where you live - for yours' and the climate's sake.
- Organise your classmates and demand better conditions for both you and your teachers - counteract budget cuts in public schools.
- Fight budget cuts in public healthcare - protest, organise, occupy.
- Elevate the struggle by not being content with temporary solutions - expose the capitalist system and work towards fighting it.

- Organise in RKU for class struggle and socialism.

Let us critique this, point for point, before talking about it as a whole.

The first point, about joining the union and fighting for better working conditions, is an attempt to enlighten to working class - but it ends up advocating reformism and class-cooperation. We'd like to call this line the "make the union an organisation for class struggle!", only that this line will end up *"making"* nothing. Here, one must assume that the union already is an organisation built for class struggle, an analysis which isn't in tune with the concrete situation in Sweden. The Swedish labour unions are tools of the ruling social fascists and bigwigs. They control the unions with interests much like those of the capitalists themselves. Frank Baude (ironically, considering his recent turn towards rightist deviation himself) wrote the following in "Vänd ansiktet mot arbetsplatserna":

> *An analysis shows that the labour unions are one of the state's greatest tools when it comes to forcing through policies of class collaboration. The working class can never conquer some parts of the state from within. That is obvious reformism. The capitalist labour union can never be conquered, it can only be crushed along with the rest of corporative capitalist society.* (Frank Baude, "Vänd ansiktet mot arbetsplatserna!" *Proletären* #4/71)

To, in the same year that LO ("Landsorganisationen", The Trade Union Congress, translator's note.) marched alongside the The Confederation of Swedish Enterprise to essentially kill the right to strike, promote the parole "join the union!", is nothing less than misleading and treason. If we are to be kind, we must assume that the executive committee and RKU wants to change the labour unions from within - but thinking that this is possible is only further proof of their lacking analysis, since they apparently have no idea how capitalist bureaucratic organisations work. They work in the same way as RKU, lacking in any internal democracy. While organising workers in unions is nothing bad in itself, we have to organise them outside the unions as well - this is especially important in a time when the labour unions are a part of the state apparatus.

The second point could not be more vague - thus, we won't dwell on it. We have to ask ourselves: How should we organise together? On which local questions? How are we supposed to fight? Maybe point three can shed some light on this. The third point, which is about demanding free public transportation, implies that we are to devote our energy towards the struggle for reforms. The demand for free public transport is not revolutionary (and we in RKU-Uppsala know a member of the Communist Party, Mario Sousa, who would argue that demanding 300 SEK for a transit card would be *much* more revolutionary), but it would fit well amongst other, more revolutionary demands. Though the lack of those forces us to consider this demand as *the* demand. Instead of mobilising people in the struggle for the ultimate goal, the socialist revolution, not having to pay to use public transport is deemed more urgent. Thus reformism.

There is not as much to criticise in the fourth and fifth points. Here, the now well-demonstrated inability to analyse the contradictions present within capitalism is present. Budget-cuts and privatizations are not always in the interests of the bourgeoisie. What is in their interests, though, is that we have a well enough of a functioning welfare system to satisfy their need for a suitable workforce. It is the reproductive part of capitalism. It is of course right to fight for workers' rights to education, healthcare and social service - but it doesn't get rid of capitalism. And it is equally important to look at these institutions *in their totality*. Issues like students having no say in their education, the lies promoted by the bourgeois school. The bureaucratic centralisation of the healthcare system that results in the centralization of health services, understaffing of hospitals and worker being pitched against worker through individually set wages, and so on. RKU is in love with the welfare state in a way that no revolutionary organisation ever should be. Interesting to note is the inclusion of the method of occupation. Is this something that RKU *ever* has actively worked for? No it is not. They can at most stand at the side shouting supportive platitudes when the people of Sollefteå occupy their maternity clinic, which was threatened with being closed. This is a false attempt at radicalism.

The two last points are catastrophic. Here, there is no mention of how to crush the rule of capital, not even the notion of doing so at all. Grammatically, "work towards fighting it" means working towards being able to fight something.

But we need to *actually fight* capitalist rule to get rid of it. Truth is, the second-last point describes the revolution as something distant, far beyond the horizon. Thinking like this will almost certainly end up in working towards the next reform, and getting trapped in a Sisyphos-like condition. The last point states that the only correct way to work towards fighting for a revolution (read: reforms) is through joining RKU. This is a kind of social-democratic working method that we revolutionaries must fight against.

This brochure is, as we just made clear, *extremely* reformist. The bullet list is an attempt to appear concrete in their thoughts, but when opportunists try this they inevitably expose themselves as reformists. The brochure is also an excellent case study in revisionism - it was created not by mandate, but through a coup by the executive committee. The contents of the brochure is a mix of confusion, crawling before the bourgeoisie, and being too afraid to mention revolution.

Finally, we want to raise our final point. How the executive committee handled the threat about our exclusion. In the criticism they raised against RKU-Uppsala, they spared no effort in making a point about how we aren't of the same opinion as the rest of RKU:

> *That RKU-Uppsala stands very far outside the rest of the organisation in terms of politics and tactics is nothing new. You surely remember the action taken by them during the election run-up, where they vandalised election posters from other parties with our own posters. Something that made the entire organisation vulnerable, as it risked harming our collaborations with the Left Party and Left Youth.* (Arvid Gustafsson. *CS-bladet* #16)

> *I leave it to Andreas Köhler to further explain about the anarchist deviation, but I want to make clear that I can see tendencies of anarchism in RKU-Uppsala. They don't care about the democratic centralism, but instead act on their own accord, utilizing direct action (the poster action) and so on.* (Arvid Gustafsson. Comment in the internal forum of the central committee of RKU regarding *CS-bladet* #16 10:37AM 2018-12-21)

> *Lastly, I would probably argue that RKU-Uppsala in many ways doesn't fulfill a positive function in our recruitment efforts in the way we desire. Their political deviation, if you want to call it that, probably scares away and distances them from working youths. Which youths can relate to the Cultural Revolution, or to burn down of parliament, or even worse, the Gothenburg riots. Their student-like opinions are probably harming our propaganda work, while at the same time they are focusing on internal politics more and more.* (Arvid Gustafsson. Comment in the internal forum of the central committee of RKU regarding *CS-bladet* #16 11:28 21/12)

> *As for Uppsala, they have taken a radicalist stance, just listen to their Red Front video or their election movie. It has also has had effects on their praxis, with anarchistic methods where they attack election posters or promote outdated real socialist aesthetic.* (Andreas Köhler. Member of AU, Comment in the internal forum of the central committee of RKU regarding *CS-bladet* #16 20:39 20/12)

If the problem lies with our politics, our theory and our ideology, say so! This whole story is about revisionists utilising administrative maneuvers to resolve contradictions. RKU-Uppsala have been promoting discussions about many questions which the renegades in the executive committee find uncomfortable, most of all regarding the fight against revisionism and taking a harder stance against police violence and repression. It's interesting that the executive committee argues that our references to the Gothenburg riots are harmful and unrealistic. The Gothenburg riots occurred not even 20 years ago, and it's a perfect example of what 'nice cops' are capable of. Furthermore, police violence against protestors have occurred multiple times since the riots in 2001 - take, for example, the innumerable nazi Salem marches during the 2000s, and the police driving a van into demonstrators after the attempt at Showan Skattak's life in 2014. We in RKU-Uppsala have ourselves been harrassed by the regional police task force. This inexplicable love for the police is just that, inexplicable. But as we see it, RKU and the Communist Party both seem to think that it's OK to bash some heads, as long as they are anarchist. Any demonstration not under the banner of RKU or the Communist Party deserves to be attacked.

To hold this opinion is not only misanthropic, it is also counterrevolutionary. The uprising of the proletariat will not come peacefully and cleanly. It will be messy, violent and met with violence in turn. Are RKU to stand on the sidelines, and urge everyone to calm down? And then laugh at the class' incompetence and hope that the batons of the policemen will teach them a lesson? Will RKU, like the social democrats did in 2001, give roses to the policemen responsible for the brutality? RKU is entirely on the bourgeoisies side here. We in the former RKU-Uppsala are in many ways different from the anarchists (regardless of what the executive committee states), but we will, unlike Arvid Gustafsson and Andreas Köhler, never take pleasure from them being repressed and beaten in the streets. Unlike Arvid and Andreas, we haven't made legality a holy cow, treating everyone who tries to work in illegal ways like gang criminals.

The executive committee of RKU gave RKU-Uppsala this confused definition of the mass organisation as a response in the debate about revisionism:

> *In this short comment, we want to make clear for everyone that RKU is structured according to the principles of the mass organisation. A mass organisation in the sense that we host a multitude of political lines, and not masses of members (which of course is a goal). This means that we shall organise youths no matter their political views. We are as open to those calling themselves marxists as those calling themselves maoists.* ("Kommentar till inlägget om revisionism", *Revolutionären* #3-18)

The executive committee laments RKU-Uppsalas *political views* at the same time as they are proposing excluding us - this mere months after explaining that all discussions about revisionism are unnecessary, since all political views are welcome in RKU! All political views, except for argumentative RKU-Uppsala's, that is.

But the executive committee have, in a way, already touched this subject. The executive committee have said that they want to work with RKU-Uppsala, but that they most of all don't want anyone in RKU to sympathise with us.

> *We also think that this exclusion might have consequences for the organisation as a whole. We want to avoid creating sympathies for Uppsala on the because of the executive committee of the central committee rushing to conclusions. Because of this we decided to give RKU-Uppsala another chance.* ("About RKU-Uppsala". Arvid Gustafsson, on behalf of the executive committee. *CS-bladet* #16-2018)

The possibility to appeal against our exclusion, our "second chance", consisted of only the opportunity to withdraw our criticisms, and crawl before the revisionists in the Communist Party and the executive committee. This "second chance" was not given us of benevolence, but as a convenient way to ensure that the executive committee can later say: *"we gave them another chance."*. The executive committee seem to be scared by the freedom of thought that members of RKU possess. They seem to be scared of the possibility that members might sympathise with us. Them holding this stance on all this is in no way compatible with claiming to be a democratic institution.

The executive committee were later forced to withdraw their threats when the central committee, instead of nodding in agreement, criticised them. We received the following email, which has a very different tone to it:

> *Hi,*
>
> *We want to preface this by apologising. Our first email was very harsh in its tone, and could easily be interpreted as an ultimatum where you would be excluded if you didn't follow our will. We acted rapidly, because we thought the situation required it, but that might have hampered our ability to think about how our words would be received. We are writing this email to make our thoughts clear, and to retract the demand that you apologise.*
>
> *We used a harsh tone in the email because we wanted to make clear how grave the situation is, and how grave your stance towards the party and the rest of RKU is. We wanted to illustrate the seriousness of the situation.*

We still see what happened as going against the rules, but we want to underline that it wasn't our intent to give you an ultimatum where the choices are "you apologising" or "you being dissolved". We wanted to explain our view on the situation: that this is going against our rules, that we will propose your dissolution to the central committee unless you apologise. It is up to the central committee, not us in the executive committee, to make such decisions. In hindsight, it might not have been a very good idea to do so regardless, since it unnecessarily escalated a conflict. We want to retract the demand about your apology.

Moving on, we will discuss this in the central committee, as we want to resolve this. This means that there is no longer any absolute requirement for you to apologise. But we still see your actions as breaking the by-laws, as explained earlier, §2.1 and §5.1. Doing so is a very serious offence. As we explained in the first email, keeping good relations between RKU and the party is important and we want there to always be cooperation between our organisations. Additionally, our internal democracy is of vital importance, as it separates us from loose organisations like, for example, SUF (Translator's note: "Syndikalistiska Ungdomsförbundet"). *We interpret your exchange of emails with K-Uppsala as forming your own line in how we should work towards the party, something that goes against the principles of democratic centralism.*

Our internal debate is free and open. Discussing changing relations between RKU and K is of course something that could be brought up internally. We oppose forming your own line in this kind of way, without talking to the rest of the organisation.

We hope that this email can explain the actions taken by the executive committee, and that we can continue having this discussion until we can resolve the problem.

Sincerely,

The Executive Committee of the Central Committee of RKU.

(Email sent from the executive committee of the central committee of RKU to RKU-Uppsala. 11:59 26/12 2018)

The executive committee's new position is a more apologetic one, which is welcome. Their actions are not something that can be tolerated in a democratic movement. Here, they retract their demand for us to withdraw our criticism - which is good for them, since doing so, throwing away our consistently revolutionary line, and submitting to the reformist and revisionist line of the Communist Party, is for us much worse than being excluded. Here, we realised how much the executive committee had retreated. It was a desperate attempt to reconcile, and to cover their tracks, an attempt to sweep contradictions under the rug using administrative maneuvers. We have to admit that this email came as a shock to us. Especially since members of the executive committee, namely and foremost Arvid Gustafsson and Andreas Köhler, have talked about us as nothing more than vermin to be exterminated.

The executive committee can have our sympathies. But the executive committee's new position is only a slightly more friendly version of the past one. They are still forcing the revisionist policies of the Communist Party into RKU, and their history is still full of violations of the principles of internal democracy.

But the real problem with the executive committee doesn't lie within its members, even if we mention the renegade duo Andreas Köhler and Arvid Gustafsson several times - they are mentioned because they serve as a representation of the rightist line within the movement. One problem lies within our organisational model - where the principles of mass organisation are distorted to mean "a mass of different lines", where internal cadre-building is met with skepticism, where the right wing can flourish. Instead of being an organisation made up of marxists and as equals, RKU has become a kind of "cool hangout" where theory is only used in a dogmatic way to show off internally.

The executive committee probably knew that they couldn't defy Pär Johansson (the General Secretary of the party). In the end, the real problem with the executive and RKU as a whole is the Communist Party. The EC are nothing but puppets of the Party. Being excluded from RKU - an organisation ruled by the

party, an undemocratic organisation and a revisionist organisation - that's not a punishment, it's absolution!

Speech is silver, silence is golden

> *Criticism within the party is generally seen as something negative and few have a scientific marxist understanding concerning how to resolve contradictions. Opposites and differences in opinion are brushed aside and are rarely brought to the surface for constructive discussion. It's common that problems or erroneous behaviour are disregarded because of a liberal attitude. To but heads with a comrade by raising faults or errors is sometimes seen as more negative than to present criticism so that the organization and the comrades can improve and develop.* (Erik Pettersson, *Vart går Kommunistiska partiet?* S. 39)

What is criticism? What is self-criticism?

Such questions can for communists seem banal. Of course we know what criticism and self-criticism is! But the actions within the movement reveal this to be untrue. The phrase "criticism and self-criticism" is often used but are empty of any actual practical content. Some comrades use self-criticism as a kind of "sorry" - it is said and then the issue is resolved. Self-criticism and criticism aren't about that comrades should apologize or take on blame. It's about the method through which the communist organization and communists develop. Criticism and self-criticism is thus, in the final analysis, a question of dialectics. Opposites confront each other and produce a new state; synthesis.

A short but illustrative example. Within RKU-Uppsala we had a period in which the members suffered from what can be called activist burnout (in Swedish more literally *political depression*). The non-rewarding, repetitive, unplanned style of work lead to contradictions with the organization. Contradictions between the members of the branch committee and the other members, within the branch committee, and contradictions between individual members and the organization. This is, from our experience, very common within both the Party and RKU. Activities and actions often come as directives from above (from CC and the EC) and there exists a very skewed way of practicing democratic centralism. The local branch committee, which is supposed to just execute the decisions of the

membership, becomes deciding, executive and directive. This creates a situation in which the branch committee becomes embittered towards the “inactive” membership, the members regard the situation as one in which they have been robbed of the chance to impact the branch’s political work. This is thoroughly destructive. RKU-Uppsala resolved this escalating situation simply by arranging a struggle session.

The personal and political contradictions were exposed, the branch committee received the member’s criticism and the committee members explained their points of view. Together the local branch reached new conclusions. The membership went through self-criticism: realizing how and why they had committed these errors and were offered the tools to not commit these errors again. This is the core of criticism and self-criticism.

The Party and RKU instead use, as we’ve already discussed, administrative maneuvers to resolve situations like this. This because the organizations are afraid of criticism, suspicious of it and has a mean spirited attitude towards being held accountable.

The importance of internal debate is brought up time and time again. *Even if I think that it’s important that we discuss great ideological questions within our organization, we must remember that we have a revolutionary program that is the foundation for our movement.* (Arvid Gustafsson, “Inlägg om motsättningar”, *CS-bladet #12-2018)* The internal debate is so necessary it doesn’t need to be waged. RKU:s existing program is per automatic revolutionary (because the organization has revolutionary in its name?) and a discussion about this or RKU:s politics overall is therefore a complete waste of time. The General Secretary continues:

> *Many within RKU talk like we would be able to make a revolution next year or within the near future. How are we supposed to be part of a revolutionary movement if we organize barely 100 of Sweden’s youth? We must first organize the masses before we can even dream to construct a theory that advances marxism-leninism in the 21st century. We must*

constantly discuss our methods and our theory, I am not in any way opposed to us waging an ideological discussion. (ibid.)

We'll start by raising the point that it must be natural for a revolutionary organization, which is active in times of crisis, that works under threats of being banned, must be ready for a changing situation. Gustafsson, as all revisionists, pushes the revolution to a time so far ahead in the future that it doesn't even exist as a possibility. He finishes his statement by being open for a discussion that he rejected as harmful for the movement. He positions RKU:s growth against the ideology, against critical discussions from the membership. How can he then mean that he is open for the debate?

Gustafsson brings up that:

Within RKU as well as the central committee there exists political differences. This is something that most of us are aware of, in certain questions we have diametrically opposed viewpoints.

/.../

Contradictions are good and necessary, they open for a political discussion within the organization, but for this to be fruitful we must let them surface and work through them by discussion

/.../

These contradictions I bring up, in many ways make it difficult for us to develop reasonable methods and reasonable practice for organizing Sweden's youth.

The goal is to organize working class youth to struggle for socialism. How do we reach that goal? Through clear class politics that is easily available for working class youth in Sweden today. (Arvid Gustafsson, "Inlägg om motsättningar", *CS-bladet* #12-2018)

So the debate is not good or necessary. Gustafsson has already dismissed the opposition (as RKU-Uppsala must be seen to represent, as Gustafsson begins his article by attacking us). The opposition is unclear, unavailable and apparently are not interested in organizing working class youth for socialism. Instead of making a point of differentiating contradictions between comrades from those that exist between us and the enemy, Gustafsson has thrown in all critics with the enemy camp. Criticism becomes an act of sabotage and is met with ridicule where the organization's only "professional revolutionary" in an internal post speaks condescendingly of the members when these are given no chance to counteract these allegations. Not until this internal document was leaked were the members of RKU-Uppsala able to see this contemptuous attitude from their General Secretary.

Gustafsson does, at least for us, raise an interesting point: *The highest priority should be on organizing the youth, not on educating the few members we have to become trained marxist-leninists* (ibid.)

The contempt of the membership is rarely brought to light this openly. All great marxist thinkers have highlighted the importance of raising awareness, of spreading marxist thinking. The importance of the revolutionary's schooling. The fact that communist is not something *you are* (as an identity), it is something *you do*. It's a duty that requires certain skills and competence, which needs to be developed. But Gustafsson does not see the membership as revolutionaries. He sees them as numbers in a registry, important only for the purpose of making RKU look big, but not for action. RKU should be like one of the parliamentary youth sections with loosely organized, uncommitted members without a larger stake or imput in the organization. This of course serves the purposes of the revisionists who man the high positions in the movement. They of course do not want an internal ideological debate - their response when one is held reveals this unwillingness.

They want members who do not question the current political line, who quietly accept this line as the only correct one and who place RKU:s growth as an organization as the only goal. An organization without cader, without involved and politically trained members is of course easier to control and manipulate for certain purposes.

Gustafsson writes:

> *I want to be clear that I am not interested in cracking down on a line I don't agree with. This is about the fact that I want to start a debate within our congregation [*translator's note: yes, he literally uses the Swedish word for congregation*]. Just like Uppsala I want to start a discussion within the whole organization. It is through discussion about our methods and about our ideology that we learn how to work towards our common goal. (ibid.)*

If this is the case, why publish this in an internal forum only accessible to members of the central committee? Why deny the members their opportunity to take part of the General Secretary's opinions about them, their work and their opinions? This cannot be seen as genuine. After one has stated how strongly one dislikes the criticism, dislikes the debate and dislike the discussion it becomes very hard to believe the statement that "of course discussion is good!"

The administrative methods to undermine debate, the false play towards the members that are not allowed to take part of the leadership's actual opinions and the strong irritations over the very existence of criticism are not to be seen as the personal failings belonging to one "comrade". These are hallmarks of a thoroughly liberal attitude towards political life that is something of a rightist opportunist classic.

Mao Tse-tungs great work *Combat Liberalism* (1937) describes just these kinds of behaviours.

> *To indulge in irresponsible criticism in private instead of actively putting forward one's suggestions to the organization. To say nothing to people to their faces but to gossip behind their backs, or to say nothing at a meeting but to gossip afterwards. To show no regard at all for the principles of collective life but to follow one's own inclination. This is a second type.*
>
> */.../*

To indulge in personal attacks, pick quarrels, vent personal spite or seek revenge instead of entering into an argument and struggling against incorrect views for the sake of unity or progress or getting the work done properly. This is a fifth type.

/.../

To regard oneself as having rendered great service to the revolution, to pride oneself on being a veteran, to disdain minor assignments while being quite unequal to major tasks, to be slipshod in work and slack in study. This is a tenth type.

This liberal attitude breeds the sort of elitism that especially the members of the executive committee freely express in the pages of *CS-bladet*. In several instances these members seem to regard themselves as a group that simply knows better than the rest and thus they are entitled to dominate and rule with an iron fist. They refer to communist principles by default, they talk foremost of needing "concrete analysis of concrete conditions" but no such analysis can be seen. Their response towards criticism says nothing, consisting of improvised gibberish. They loosely define the mass organisation in a perfunctory and inconsistent way to serve their own purposes. The EC once meant that RKU has "freedom of criticism", but then one of the branches are threatened with exclusion for having "propagated their own line." To be concrete is only a virtue in theory, in practice the EC like most revisionists appear contradictory, incoherent and speak only in riddles without content.

The EC has thoroughly acted as a destructive force for the work of the central committee. It's members have often and in great length gone behind other CC-members backs and shared their criticism in the form of gossip and slander instead of in open debate. This is the way of the bourgeois parties. Where internal conflicts are held in the eye of the media and through campaigns of libel. RKU is of course a very small organization and because of its pleasant non-threatening reformist politics, uninteresting for the media (even *Proletären*). Thus the debate is waged through gossip.

During our time in the movement one steady source of complaint was the quiet and dead discussion in our internal journal *Revolutionären*. Members of the central committee that have served longer than the period 2017-2019 often brought up the problems of the discussion around RKU:s paper *Rebell*. There were many sighs over the fact that no one seemed to be interested in discussing the paper and that this discussion only could be held during the congress of 2017. This of course also stinks of a bureaucratic point of view - where one thinks one can order the membership to discuss something without preparation, without anchoring it in the organization, without presenting the problem. When the members do actually show some interest in a topic and many articles are sent in to be published - then the debate is rejected and suffocated to death. For us it's no wonder that not much is discussed in the internal paper of RKU - the only allowed topics are decided for the membership, which alienates most. Questions like, how to wage a better housing campaign, why XYZ went poorly (the answer is always that it's the members fault. Never the leadership) or scattered directives to write more, report more, do more and be better.

The admonitory internal culture in RKU has an essentially neoliberal character where all mistakes are the faults of individuals who didn't try hard enough. This kind of thinking sees all criticism from the members as excuses for laziness. Thus one should always only strive to turn the organization to a mass organization. That this is something that one can have different opinions about is something the EC-revisionists seem to have trouble grappling with. There is only one acceptable political line - join us or die.

Despite 25 years of this political line RKU has only diminished - the mass organization becomes only more distant as the years go by. There seems to be no realization that the constant expulsions, the thought policing in the movement, the admonishing and judgy internal culture, the unwillingness to new thinking, the unwillingness to renew oneself and the total refusal to accept any sort of criticism can be the reasons for the state of the organization. A movement that constantly mutilates itself but cannot grasp why it is bleeding certainly deserves its fate. Especially after generations of members have tried to bring the issues to light.

Oppression is freedom. Repression is safety.

The question of the state's monopoly on violence is an important question for communists to tackle. During the seventies, the revolutionary KFML(r) exposed the revisionists in KFML who had decided to support the police strike that was ongoing. KFML(r) published the following statement in *Proletären*:

> We will NEVER support the police!
> Every class conscious worker knows that the police are the guard dogs of monopoly capital, with the task to crack down on the struggle of the working class. We therefore urge police officers who have gotten tired of their dirty work:
> QUIT! - SEEK HONEST EMPLOYMENT!

This statement is a good example of a clear sighted analysis. Marxists has always considered that the bourgeois monopoly on violence, must be crushed. All support for the bourgeois police and military, is support for the repression of the working class and a betrayal of the revolution. Lenin explained the position on the police held by revolutionaries, the Social Democrats and that of the right wing reactionaries.

> *Does the state need the usual type of police and a standing army?*
> *A. (to the right of the C.D.) and B. (C.D.). It certainly does, for they are the only firm guarantee of the rule of the capitalists; in case of need, as the, experience of all countries has shown, the return from a republic to a monarchy is thus greatly facilitated.*
> *C. (S.D. and S.R.). On the one hand, they are perhaps not necessary. On the other hand, is not so radical a change premature? However, we shall raise the matter in the Contact Commission.*
> *D. ("Bolsheviks"). It definitely does not. The arming of the entire people must be proceeded with everywhere immediately and unreservedly, and they must be merged with the militia and the army. The capitalists must pay the workers for days served in the militia.* (Lenin. Political Parties in Russia and the Tasks of the Proletariat)

The position of revolutionaries regarding the police and the bourgeois states monopoly on violence, has historically always been that of its dismantling, one of unyielding opposition. It will therefore not surprise any perceptive marxist that our revisionists in the Communist Party and Revolutionary Communist Youth, vacillates on this point. They have as we here will show, abandoned the revolutionary line completely and veered to a social chauvinistic idea of law and order for “Swedish” workers. Leading the march backwards has been the Malmö branch of the Communist Party, who on the 11/8 2018 published the following picture with the associated text, on their facebook page:

The text reads: We want more beat cops in Malmö
Prevent crimes - create safety.

The bourgeois alliance wants to send in the military into vulnerable neighborhoods. That’s the wrong way to go. But the fact remains that a lot of neighborhoods in Malmö are unsafe. We therefore think that the police should patrol the streets and be seen. We want to reinstate beat cops who know the neighborhood and the people living there. Through being close to the action they can prevent crime.
With regards to the latest fatal shooting of a mentally disabled man, are we going to raise the question of whether or not the police have to be armed? In

> *Norway the police is unarmed with exception for emergency situations which has worked out fine.*
> *We turn towards a development where the national task force of the swedish police comes thundering into vulnerable areas with guns out whenever a crime has been committed. Together with the good forces in the neighborhoods, with common honest people and with sports associations can beat cops create the security that we all want.* (The Communist Party Malmö. facebook.com/KPMalmo/. 11/8 2018. [accessed: 30/12 2018])

The first thing to observe here is the Orwellian portrayal of this as an attempt to intervene against the repression of the police. By lifting the fact that the bourgeoisie wants to strengthen the police, they're able to wiggle themselves past the fact that they to want to strengthen the police. They're essentially saying that "If we don't support the police, the Alliance will do it!", a dishonest argument that, in fact, isn't in contradiction with what they claim to oppose. We'll have to break this down to its component parts.

The demand for beat cops is a position that's not grounded in a marxist view of the state. That the state in our society is of the bourgeois type and it only exists to repress the working class. The state can be said to have two methods of ruling, one with the whip and one with the carrot. Here we see the Communist Party demanding that the state should use the carrot rather than the whip, or in other words, that the repression should be of the "nice kind". Beat cops could from a marxist perspective be called "class collaboration cops", because that's just what they are. The idea that you shouldn't oppose the police as an institution and instead try to coexist with them, is nothing more than class collaborationism. It hinders us from being able to see something bigger, it behaves in accordance to the institutions and framework of our current society instead of looking beyond them and crushing them. As marxists we must be fully aware that the police, good cop as bad cop, is the guard dogs of the monopoly capitalists and their interests does not deviate from those of the capitalist class. Lenin writes the following:

> *The centralized state power that is peculiar to bourgeois society came into being in the period of the fall of absolutism. Two institutions are most characteristic of this state machine: the bureaucracy and the standing*

> *army. In their works, Marx and Engels repeatedly show that it is the bourgeoisie with whom these institutions are connected by thousands of threads. The experience of every worker illustrates this connection in an extremely graphic and impressive manner. From its own bitter experience, the working class learns to recognize this connection; that is why it so easily grasps and so firmly learns the science which shows the inevitability of this connection, a science which the petty-bourgeois democrats either ignorantly and flippantly deny, or, still more flippantly, admit "in general," while forgetting to draw the corresponding practical conclusions.* (Lenin. The State and the Revolution. Selected works II, the first part, Swedish edition. p. 225)

We can here see how the Communist Party has like the petty bourgeois democrats of Lenin's time, may admit to the existing antagonism between the police and the working class “in general” but how they consistently fails to draw the corresponding conclusions that this doctrine tells us; to advocate for and work towards, the crushing of this institution and the creation of people’s militias. The Communist Party seem to discard the support for spontaneous rebellions in the suburban areas and instead promotes class-peace. Their comment about how the police should be disarmed, like in Norway where they only carry weapons in case of emergency, points in just this direction. The disarming of the police is a small progressive step towards its disbanding but the exception of “emergencies” shows that nothing remains particularly different. When it is the bourgeoisie that sets the agenda, when the oppressors wants to maintain the stability of their oppressive system, then are not spontaneous violent rebellions an emergency? Even worse, would not a conscious and organized rebellion be an even greater case of emergency? The definition of an emergency is still in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the police keep functioning as a repressive institution with a monopoly on violence.

This is however not to say that this line never faced any opposition. This statement from the Malmö branch may have passed with impunity, ney encouraged, by the Communist Party, but it faced a strong backlash from the actually revolutionary comrades in the movement, mainly concentrated in the youth organisation. After comrade Erik Kalantar of RKU-Uppsala appealed to the Communist Party’s Malmö branch, we elected to write a text about the police to the

internal debate forum *Revolutionären* (The Revolutionary). The following is the text in its entirety:

> *The question of police brutality has come up on the agenda again after the police in Stockholm shot a young man with Downs syndrome on 9/8. Our bourgeois media are trying to spin the story to be about just one singular tragedy, but for us communists it should be obvious that cases like these are a part of the way the police functions. This is however not the case in our movement - there is a strong divergence of views within RKU and the Communist Party, over the police and its role in our society. The Uppsala branch* [of RKU]*is of the opinion that RKU is missing a clear line while our party has adopted a pro-cop and counterrevolutionary line. They think that the police stands "above" the class conflicts and instead can work as our protector while they defend private property and the bourgeois state. They mean that the police maintains a "order" - but whos order? How can order be understood as a neutral concept, free from class society and its contradictions? The knights may have maintained the king's order in the feudal society but they also raped the women of the peasant class and murdered its men.*
>
> *The fact that communists have decided to take up the line of "Law and order"(a line which traditionally has been pushed by the far right) is to us a great misstep. The analysis (if there even is one) behind the statement "We want beat cops" and others of its ilk, is built on the view the institutions of the state functions independently from the state, that in the end, the state can have a neutral function in capitalism. This is an old social democratic analysis - it is the foundation of reformism.*
>
> *It is of course not only on a theoretical or analytical plane that this policy is harmful and wrong. It is out of touch with reality in that it doesn't take into consideration who are affected by police brutality and that the police is through and through a racist institution. Immigrants and people living in the suburbs are the ones who are affected by being constantly being monitored and harrased by the police. How are we as revolutionaries going to be able to reach the youth and working class immigrants if we at the same time think that their lives should be controlled by the police? How then can we in that case see ourselves as*

representing the interests of the working class; if we write off a large part of it as criminals who needs to be handled by the police? It's rather the case that what's needed is a higher presence of the revolutionary avant-garde, of the revolutionary youth organisation. The reactions we see in the suburban areas are reactions on class society against the bourgeois state. Sure they are spontaneous and unconscious, and sure burning cars won't make a revolution, but is it not our duty as revolutionaries to raise and transform the unconscious and spontaneous struggle into an organized and class conscious one?

If we also observe the lessons from other revolutionaries in different countries and their struggle, we'll see the thorough reactionary character of the police. The same day as Eric Thorell [the young man with Down's syndrome, translator's note] was shot in Stockholm, Michael Brown four years earlier was shot in Ferguson, Missouri. This event was the starting point of the most radical wave of left wing politics that the US had seen since the sixties. The Black Lives Matter-movement isn't in any way dominated by left wing radicals but their analysis is still based in the fact that the police can't be reformed into another institution. They demand that areas dominated by the black population of the US should oversee and have control over the police, they demand an end to the militarization of the police and an end to SWAT teams and racial profiling. American revolutionaries, primarily the marxist-leninist Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, pursued an active policy of monitoring the police. Armed with guns and knowledge of the law they intervened when Oakland's police tried to arrest members of the black community. They took it upon themselves to defend their areas, mainly from the police!

The American examples are worthy of studying since the conditions of the US are more and more reflected here in Sweden. The segregation in our country has created the same kind of problems but we offer no revolutionary solutions. The US example shows that there can be an enormous police presence without the crime rates decreasing. The question is not to be solved by condemning an entire population to the good will of the police - it is solved by changing the power relations.

If we want a socialist society, if we want a revolution, how then will we be able to achieve this without building an alternative power base

> *parallel to the bourgeois state? How will we be able to radicalise the working class if we at the same time put our trust in our class enemy to solve every problem for us? How will we be able to make revolution, if we at the same time are going to defend the bourgeois law and order? It won't do!* (RKU-Uppsala, Om polisiära frågan. *Revolutionären* #3-18)

This text was meant to be the start of a long discussion that RKU-Uppsala intended to result in a motion to the congress about adding a point on police brutality to the program as well as a point on the establishment of a power base parallel to the bourgeois state. However that didn't happen. The same clique that ended up liquidating RKU-Uppsala screamed in terror at the thought of a consistent revolutionary line.

Firstly we'll criticise RKU-Karlstad, represented in the executive committee by Andreas Köhler and in their *Revolutionären*-text represented as anti-marxists. The following is what they had to say about our position on the police:

> *In the latest Revolutionären, RKU-Uppsala wrote three texts, one about the Communist Party's and RKU:s stance on the police question, one on cadre discipline and one about advancing an anti-revisionist line. We in RKU-Karlstad have no opinion on the cadre discipline, but the two other texts we find ourselves diametrically opposed to Uppsala. We consider the police in today's Sweden to be insufficient and there is an interest in maintaining a functioning judicial system instead of different constellations of criminal gangs running different neighborhoods. At a point where the working class is class conscious and able to form its own guards to maintain order, then we can discuss the police question and the bourgeois state.* (RKU-Karlstad, Kritik mot Uppsala. Revolutionären #4-18)

Here we see how RKU-Karlstad takes the same position as KFML once did to justify their support for the police. The difference in this case is that KFML in comparison to RKU-Karlstad, seem like a really revolutionary organisation. Because now it's no longer a question of trying to turn the individual cops demands for higher wages into socialist consciousness. For RKU-Karlstad the question is about trying to strengthen police as an institution. It's a demand to directly

strengthen the class enemy. RKU-Karlstad are however correct when they're saying that "there is an interest in maintaining a functioning judicial system", it is the interest of the bourgeoisie. RKU-Karlstad does not see that the revolutionary vanguard and the revolutionarily organised working class, is in the eyes of the bourgeoisie something even worse than a "criminal gang", they do not see this because they themselves has abandoned any thought about revolution and instead made the bourgeois legality into a sacred cow. This is not to claim that a "criminal gang" will ever make a revolution, and in a lot of ways they're the enemies of the revolution being only another expression of the capitalist system. Of course a revolutionary movement should never be organised in the same way as a "criminal gang" is. But a revolutionary movement will eventually need to cross the boundaries of the bourgeois legality, and it will be a separate power base inside of this society. Is that not enough for it to be placed in the same category with "criminal gangs"?

Furthermore, they comment on the idea that it is not yet time for these discussions. This echoes the same way of thinking as did the socialist revolutionaries and Social-Democrats of Lenin's era *"is not so radical a change premature?"* is just what RKU-Karlstad is asking in their claim. They are completely separated from the revolution and like Kautsky once did they have turned their backs on it.

> *If it has not* [begun]*, then Kautsky will turn his back on revolution! Kautsky does not display a shade of understanding of the truth that a revolutionary Marxist differs from the philistine and petty bourgeois by his ability to preach to the uneducated masses that the maturing revolution is necessary, to prove that it is inevitable, to explain its benefits to the people, and to prepare the proletariat and all the working and exploited people for it*. (Lenin: *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*. Selected works II, second part, swedish edition. p 100)

If the working class has not yet become magically class conscious and is able to take the power into their own hands, then according to RKU-Karlstad we shouldn't even entertain the idea that we should agitate about it to them. To call them modern Kautskyites would be too much of a compliment on our part, we can

therefore say call them nothing more than a reactionary social democratic clique with predilection towards the state.

However, RKU-Karlstad was not alone in their confusion concerning the state and its monopoly on violence. From the top of the organisation the earlier mentioned renegade Arvid Gustafsson raised many concerns over the line RKU-Uppsala had put forward regarding the police. In a text to *CS-Bladet* #12-18 he tries to criticise us before the central committee in hopes of solving the contradictions between the revolutionary line and his own. Gustafsson wrote the following:

> *Concerning the first text, our party and RKU have both made their lines clear in regards to repression and the role of the police in the bourgeois state. What we write is in total accordance to the marxist analysis of the state that Uppsala are requesting. But we have to remember that we are just that, marxists. We make concrete analyzes of real conditions. Therefore we can both consider the police as the repressive organ of the bourgeois state and yet demand that the working class, the people, should get the protection they need against criminality. Therefore I personally think that the demand for more beat cops is a correct one, because I can see the necessity of a police who acts against criminality and gang violence, while I know that we can't trust the police in a revolutionary situation (just like we can't trust the lumpenproletariat).* (Arvid Gustafsson, *Inlägg om motsättningar*. *CS-bladet* #12-18)

Here Gustafsson tries to, through pompous phrases, invoke "*concrete analyzes of real conditions*."[sic]. He doesn't say what this analysis is, instead he uses it as a way to insinuate that our consistent revolutionary line is unrealistic and not concrete. He promotes the police as a protector of the working class against its own members (and the lumpenproletariat), not knowing that, or maybe fully knowledgeable of, the fact that the police discriminates and profiles people best they want. He tries to separate the police's primary function from its secondary and through some opportunist magic he gets it to do one but not the other. Whatever demands you try to make on the police, to stop with the repression and only "protect against criminals" they'll never do it. This is to separate the monopoly on

violence from its historical task and to in a utopian way wish for a nice police that only goes after “criminals”. This also makes the bourgeois legality into a sacred cow, something that revolutionaries should defend. We say that it is highly interesting to hear this coming from someone who is general secretary of **Revolutionary** Communist Youth. Gustafsson would do good in explaining how he intends to go through with his revolution without being considered a “criminal” by the same state he intends to crush.

Both RKU-Karlstads text and Gustafssons claims echoes a classical revisionist distrust for the masses. The working class is too backwards, too stupid, too lowly conscious, to be able to take matters in their own hands. Therefore the police will have to save the class from itself, the police, the bourgeois state becomes the hero and the working class is simultaneously the villain and the victim. To this we can do nothing but stand diametrically opposed. It is the masses who are the real heroes and the only ones who have shown themselves too stupid for the revolution are these opportunists.

The Communist Party and the election of 2018

The year of the liquidation, 2018, was an election year. This is no coincidence. The way the Communist Party handled its election campaign was nothing more than lamentable from a revolutionary perspective, and pitiful from their own reformist perspective. The election campaign can be considered to be the beginning of the end of RKU-Uppsala, since it was in the criticism of the party's handling of different questions concerning the campaign that lead to us being forced to leave. But should we even begin to call the Communist party reformist, we'll have to firstly describe what a revolutionary election campaign is, as Lenin put it.

> *The principal question for Social-Democrats*[read: communists. Our remark] *who value the elections primarily as a means for the political enlightenment of the people, is, of course, the ideological and political content of all the propaganda and agitation to be carried on in Connection with them. That is what is meant by an election platform. To every party at all worthy of the name a platform is something that has existed long before the elections; it is not something specially devised "for the elections", but an inevitable result of the whole work of the party, of the way the work is organised, and of its whole trend in the given historical period. And the R.S.D.L.P., too, already has a platform; its platform already exists and has been naturally and inevitably determined by the Party's principles and by the tactics which the Party has already adopted, has already applied, and is still applying, during the entire period in the political life of the nation which in a certain respect is always "summed up" by elections.* (Lenin: *The Election Campaign and the Election Platform. Lenin on the Communist election campaign,* Proletärkultur 1973, p. 145)

Lenin defines the election campaign as an opportunity for Communists to further the same message that we always advocate for - the necessity of socialism, the necessity of a violent revolution, the unveiling of the parliamentary myths. The Communist Party considers itself to be a Marxist-Leninist party and defines itself as that in its party program. But in this "Marxist-Leninist" party, they gave out an

election platform that's called "This is why you should vote for the Communist Party" where the first reason is:

> *The local candidacies differs from each other in demands, propositions and programs depending on the local conditions and burning questions for the working population in the specific county. You'll find all the local election programs via the Communists webpage!*
> *They're all however united in that they originate from a working class perspective and anti-capitalist policies. The Communists are for collective welfare and welfare services instead of privatization and austerity, we're for the needs governing instead of the budget, and we're for a participatory democracy instead of a spectator democracy.*

Here in they package an agitational slogan (because shock horror if it were actually a theoretical statement!) that has come to be the basis of the Communist party's entire position on the election, if not towards the state. The slogan is "participatory democracy instead of a spectator democracy". When they invoke this slogan, they usually claim that they want to "expand democracy", something that definitely sounds noble to the untrained ear but to the marxist it comes across as completely lacking in substance. Marxism teaches us that the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie is going to be replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communist Party teaches us that spectator democracy is going to be broken by participatory democracy. They obviously don't understand the implication of the marxist teaching and apparently don't see the contradiction between it and their own make believe.

The Communist Party's understanding of the dictatorship of the proletariat seem to be that it is merely an extension of the bourgeois democracy, a line pushed further in the *Proletären*-editorial piece "*participatory democracy or spectator democracy?"* where these confused democrats write:

> *The spectator democracy in sweden during the twenty first century means that in practice, the voters are placed under legal guardians and are happy to be sovereign only during the election day - one day every 1460*

> *days. It is then not weird that only about 20 percent of swedes considers themselves to be able to affect political decisions in between elections. No one can ignore the fact that spectator democracy leads to megalomania in the top and impotence and passivity among the people that make up the demos in democracy. The cure is called participatory democracy and it is only created by the spectators stepping down from their seatings and getting involved in the game. The Communists aspire to be a part of that movement, down from the position as spectators. Only deeply reactionary security directors in Borås could view this as a threat to democracy. It however being a threat towards capitalism and the people in power who govern the spectator democracy is another story.* (Deltagardemokrati eller Åskådardemokrati? Proletären 23/1 2018)

First and foremost we'll have to ask where the small concept of *class* went? When the Communist Party talks about the state as a "spectator democracy" and claim to aspire a "participatory democracy", the concept of class shines with its absence. Instead of the working class crushing the bourgeois state through a violent revolution, the "spectators will be stepping down from their seatings and get involved in the game". The Communist party here displays its expertise in writing catchy bullshit and its complete lack of reading comprehension regarding their studies. They have thrown all that is class analysis in the dumps and instead promotes a kind of populist slogan. The "spectators" have no class orientation - the limitations of bourgeois democracy for specifically the working class is not expounded upon. "Spectators" can be anyone and ironically, for a party that otherwise fetischizes a stereotypical view of the working class, is a demand that might as well come from the green party. But this is a part of the general trend of the communist party; like how it is within social democracy, they invoke the working class only as a rhetorical maneuver or as an ornament. Often as a battering ram to separate themselves from other organizations and wrong-thinkers.

Furthermore, they only speak of an extension of the bourgeois democracy. They want "common people"(a phrase often used to not have to deal with annoying class analyzes) to get involved in politics and they create a problem around the fact that the election only is once every four years. Here the problem lies in the fact that they don't understand capitalism or the state, in any way. They claim that their line

is a threat towards capitalism but doesn't expand on how it is, presumably because it isn't but if these revisionists keep claiming that it is, it will eventually become true. Lenin criticized these people of his time, the ones who only wanted to expand democracy, in the following way:

> *"We", the revolutionary Marxists, never made speeches to the people that the Kautskyites of all nations love to make, cringing before the bourgeoisie, adapting themselves to the bourgeois parliamentary system, keeping silent about the bourgeois character of modern democracy and demanding only its extension, only that it be carried to its logical conclusion.*
> *"We" said to the bourgeoisie: You, exploiters and hypocrites, talk about democracy, while at every step you erect thousands of barriers to prevent the oppressed people from taking part in politics. We take you at your word and, in the interests of these people, demand the extension of your bourgeois democracy in order to prepare the people for revolution for the purpose of overthrowing you, the exploiters. And if you exploiters attempt to offer resistance to our proletarian revolution we shall ruthlessly suppress you; we shall deprive you of all rights; more than that, we shall not give you any bread, for in our proletarian republic the exploiters will have no rights, they will be deprived of fire and water, for we are socialists in real earnest, and not in the Scheidemann or Kautsky fashion.* (Lenin: The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky. Collected works, swedish edition)

They also promised that the Communists should act as a as "a true opposition in the municipal council", that "with the Communist Party in the municipal council it will be harder for politicians to hide their austerity measures and privatization politics or making decisions behind peoples backs.", that the communist party "will never betray, and accept any cuts", that it is "a party of and for workers" and that "with the communist party in the municipal council, fighting people will have a friend and a voice among the politicians".

This doesn't unveil the parliamentary myths. It rather plays into them and maintains them. Winning positions for the working class in the municipal council is

not a “true opposition”, it is in no way a method to exercise any influence, it is only a channel through which the revolutionary message can be spread.

We can further analyse their reformism through comparing the Communist Party’s program with the Left party’s election program from the same election. The left Party who are explicit reformists. They demand “a Sweden for everyone - not only for the rich”, that “the people should decide - not banks and big corporations”, that “everyone should be able to have a safe job”, “you should be able to trust the welfare”, “justice for the betrayed sweden” and “Sweden should be a voice for peace and justice - not increased militarization”. We lift these examples to show that the “revolutionary” and the reformist alternatives doesn’t vary in any way when they encourage people to vote for them. The revolutionary and communist in the politics of the Communist Party seems to be in only the name. A name that by the way has been left out of many local candidacies, the Gothenburg branch being the best example with the main call was for “more workers in the municipal council!” an argument that falls flat once realizing that the municipal council in gothenburg already have plenty of workers in it.

The Communist Party built its candidacies on being a “workers alternative” in the politics. But in what way? We consider the only truly workers alternative would work to organize the class against capitalism, the system that usurps and oppress them. A true workers alternative would not flinch at placing socialism - the society where the working class owns the means of production and where exploitation by capital has been done away with - on the agenda. Instead they talk vaguely about “spectator democracy” and that they are against privatizations. Exactly the same policies pushed by all other parties on the left. What then is it that makes the Communist Party into a workers alternative - if the left party pushes for the exact same policies? The Left Party is routinely called an “academics and middle class party” who’s lost its base in the working class and turned away from class politics, by the Communist Party. A revolutionary would have argued that the communists are a workers alternative since they represent the objective interests of the working class - crushing capitalism. A revolutionary would have argued that the communists work for the abolition of the entire system which creates the crises that the working class has to endure.

The Communist party considers itself a workers alternative since there are members who are workers. But workers are in greater numbers members of the Left party and the social democrats than in the Communist party since they're bigger. Going with this reasoning why should these parties not be better workers alternatives? The Communist Party's base for claiming themselves to be a workers alternative stems only from them having workers among their ranks - *but so does the other parties.*

The Communist party has constantly in their propaganda and rhetoric lift their workers representation. In their election platform they write "on the 17 municipal election lists, there is a large majority of workers and all the first names are workers". The political quality of their first names is secondary, their qualifications as revolutionaries not even worth raising. The only important fact is that they are workers. But there is a clear political reason why they use this rhetorical maneuver: there is nothing else that separates them from other reformist parties. They have taken hold of a thing they self-righteously think distinguishes them from everyone else (their representation), which they bring forth without any basis for their claim, as special about them. It's not based on any analysis of the composition of other parties and movements - which makes this fetischization of the "workers" party a bit bizarre. We agree that a party, regardless of its class composition, can pursue a different class policy. Just look at Social Democracy. But the Communist Party does not base their criticism of other movements on political or ideological analyzes - but only from the perspective of how these are composed. They have a mechanical and dead view of the relation between base and superstructure, between material and ideological phenomena, between class affiliation and ideology. Workers can be liberals! Capitalists can be socialists! But this mechanistic view has served them well - all criticism can be dismissed as malevolent lies from the "middle class" or from radical students.

The text reads: “workers party” Workers party.

How does the communist party then differentiate itself from the disdained identity politics? Where identity markers becomes political battering rams in debates. Where the analysis originates from one's own identity and not from any political substance. The Party has especially in the years after the migrant crisis of 2015, blamed identity politics for all failures of the left wing. Identity politcs has however never been defined as a particular ideology in any way. Instead they throw around statements like the following one from party chairman Robert Mathiassons infamous *Proletären*-editorial “Vad gör vänstern för fel när arbetare röstar på Sverigedemokraterna?” (What does the left do wrong when workers vote for the Sweden-Democrats):

> *According to the middle class left the problem consists of swedish society being racist and native swedes being racist. Instead of attacking the implemented policies, the middle class left has nothing but contempt for those workers that react all more negatively when they see the consequences of the implemented policies.*

Citation needed. Who in the so called “middle class left” has ever thrown themselves with these kinds of statement? Who actually represents this political line? Robert Mathiasson rides out like Don Quixote to defeat wind-mills. The middle class left is only a rhetorical device. That the bourgeois left doesn’t pursue revolutionary politics should not come as any great chock for a communist, especially someone experienced enough to gain the position of party chairman in a so called communist party. Instead of analysing these conditions in a materialist way, instead of seeing their root cause in the development of capitalism in the 20th century, it’s development into imperialism and how that affects the working class’ organizations, they spit out simplistic and conspiratorial dogmas. The Left propagates an anti-worker politic because they have contempt for them and has lost “their rooting in the working class” (same editorial piece as above quote). To accuse another organization for not having a rooting in the working class is bizarre when it comes from K. A party that talks fondly of their own roots in the class solely because a number of workers represent the Communist Party in local elections and many members are working class. By the same logic the Left Party is more of a working class party, sine 9 % of the members of the swedish Trade Union Congress voted for that party in the election of 2018 (according to *Arbetet* “Nya siffror: Så röstade LO-medlemmarna”, 12/9) and they have a much larger representation in the trade unions than K. Thus the party’s criticism of the left in general as lacking in working class members is based not in facts or in logic. Only emotional party romanticism - the party is a workers’ party because it is and all the others are not.

It also of course serves to give a party a reason for being - if all other parties are middle class parties the Communist Party at least has something “unique” when their politics is anything but. When their political positions are identical to the Left Party and the Sweden Democrats’ positions, the identity of “worker” fills the void actual revolutionary politics left behind.

In Ks list of reasons to vote for them they finish by stating:

> *It will help strengthen a new, independent working-class movement on a national level. We are all the more often asked why we arent standing for election to parliament. At the current time we don’t have the resources to undertake a parliamentary election in a good and serious way. It is*

frustrating, since there is an urgent need for a real workers' alternative on the national level as well.

An alternative that promotes a class politics instead of identity politics. That dares support an anti-imperialist foreign policy and an anti-capitalist politics at home. That strives to unite workers and regular people in common struggle, regardless of these being members of any party or not. A force that strives for unity around that which we have in common, instead of being divided by that which don't.

Our ambition is to stand in the parliamentary election of 2022, alone or together with other parties. A parliamentary candidacy would of course be strengthened by a larger number of municipal mandates. ("Därför ska du rösta på kommunistiska partiet!" kommunisterna.org [hämtat 2018-01-28)

Once again the party fights the spectre of identity politics - when they themselves see worker as an identity that needs to be allowed to speak. There is also a concerning lack of distinction between the whole working-class and it's most aware and advanced detachment - the communists. The party sees themselves as the whole class. But the working-class movement is not, cannot and should not be the same as the party. The working-class movement consists of various class organisations (trade unions, cultural associations, educational associations and so on) that have different purposes. The party is supposed to be the leading detachment of the working class - those who organize the class in our struggle, through which they make their class-siblings aware of the need for a socialist revolution. K lowers the level of the party to a radical trade union.

Also of concern is that the party has abandoned every tactic worthy of the name leninist. Lenin wrote:

For, as far as the Social-Democrats are concerned, elections are not a special political operation, not an attempt to win seats through all sorts of promises and declarations, but merely a special occasion for advocating the basic demands and the principles of the political world outlook of the

class-conscious proletariat. (Lenin, "The Platform of the Reformists and the Platform of the Revolutionary Social-Democrats", 1912)

K instead rebrands the whole party to win more votes. They change their party symbol, tone down their politics and don't even use the word communist in their election propaganda. They totally ignore the necessity of revolution and flatly refuse to express the political world outlook of the class-conscious proletariat. Utter parliamentary cretinism as Lenin would say. The party has abandoned all form of struggle, all strategy and and all tactics that doesn't revolve around the parliamentary election. The years between the elections only revolve around preparing for the next one. The coming years will revolve around a bid for parliament in 2022.

In the final analysis, despite all the gibberish that a vote for the Communist Party was a vote for a new working-class movement, it seems that for the leadership of the Communist Party their members might as well vote for the Left Party. The Communist Party's two foremost candidates in the municipal election in Gothenburg in 2018, Ulf Nilsson and Ingrid Frejd, expressed the view of the party in the article "Göteborg behöver en verklig vänsterpolitik" (*Göteborgs-Posten*, 4/9 2018) (Gothenburg needs a real left-politics):

We'll be there are a thorn in the Left Party's side. With us in the municipal council they will not be able to silently betray their voters, forget their elections promises and adjust to so called responsible politics.

Please vote for the Left Party in the parliamentary and regional elections. But vote for the Communist Party in the municipal election in Gothenburg, for a real leftist politics that never will betray.

Thus the Communist Party has no reason for being. They exist only a tail to the Left Party. They are only the Left Party's friendly critics. A party the Communist Party has recognized as an aggressive support for imperialist powers, whose former foreign policy spokesperson Hans Linde has secret talks with the US embassy in Sweden. Whose parliamentary group voted for the Swedish participation in the NATO attack against Libya in 2011. Who speaks in dismay when the US stops their

bombardment of Syria. A party that is rightfully known as the bomber left ("Bombvänstern") by members of the Communist Party. Of course it doesn't shock us that the Communist Party doesn't really care about solidarity with those oppressed by imperialism. Their position in regards to asylum seekers, migration and refugees has long since proven that. At this moment we can state that the Communist Party draws the same incorrect seperation between foreign and domestic politics that all other bourgeois parties do to justify their silence or support of imperialism. Support for the Left Party apparently doesn't mean support for imperialism - if it is an election year.

When the top names in an election, representing the strongest branch in the party, means that their members should vote for another party - why are they even organized in the Communist Party? The Communist Party of Sweden had the same appeal to their members and voters during the 50s and 60s, to vote for the Social Democrats as well as dissolving their own first of may celebrations. A total abandonment of the party's practical work, it's independence and the possibility for us communists fulfilling our primary task: *to organize the working-class for a revolution, not better reforms!*

But in the final analysis this is Ks only purpose: to be the somewhat more reliable reformists. Those mandates they've won have been won on that basis. K is a branch organization for people who want to be well off. But not much more.

Valkampanjen i siffror (9/8-9/9)
▸ 226 st ny "gillare" på Facebook.
▸ 88 st inlägg på Facebook med en total räckvidd på 307 360.*
▸ 174 st nya Proletärenprenumeranter.
▸ 22 st medlemsansökningar via kommunisterna.org.
*Antalet personer som fått upp inlägg från oss i ett sitt flöde.

Statistics published in Ks internal paper Klasskampen #2-2018. It presents the following facts: 226 new likes on facebook, 88 new posts on facebook with a total reach of 307 360, 174 new subscribers to Proletären and 22 new applications for membership.

K has no larger ambitions than this sad lite graph showcases. Likes, views on facebook, subscribers and members. The grey, dull and sad limits of parliamentarism cannot be more adequately expressed.

Of course this reformism doesn't just affect the rhetoric and goals of the party during an election. The whole party work is affected on a deep level. The election campaign of 2018 illustrated what the party considers to be communist work. On their website they illustrate their politics ("What we do") with a video from their posterboy Karl-Gustav Nilsson's "coup" at the shareholder's meeting of Nordea in april of 2018. The party, the members and the class disappear. The collective work and leadership is erased. Instead the communist work is reduced to revolve around individual posterboy's great actions. the Communist Party thus has the same view of the revolutionary and the class as the russian anarchists did, who were criticized by Russia's marxists for their:

> *...false theory [which] maintained that it is only outstanding individuals who make history, while the masses, the people, the class, the "mob," as the Narodnik writers contemptuously called them, are incapable of conscious, organized activity and can only blindly follow the "heroes."* (History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks) Short Course. 1938)

The hero worship of Nilsson is no one time event. It was the core of the whole failed election campaign the party wages in 2018. They named him "The Slaughterer of Banks" (Nilsson works as a slaughterer) and wrote 12 *Proletären* articles about him in 2018. The same number that party chairman Mathiasson was either mentioned in or wrote himself. The General Secretary of the Party, Pär Johansson, named him "Enemy #1 for the banks" (*Proletären* 22/3-2018). In the editorial of the same name (Storbankernas fiende nummer ett), Johansson writes *"the slaughterer Karl Gustav Nilsson shows us that it is time for the powerless to raise their voices"*. The devotional rhetoric from the party quickly becomes absurd. Nilsson himself, in the article "På besök hos bankslaktaren" (*Proletären* 31/3-2018) (A visit to the slaughterer of banks) express the view that he *actually* is "a regular person". The hero worship is of course laughable. That the Communist Party thinks they need to spell it out that Nilsson actually is a regular person makes it very obvious that the party sees some of its members as an aristocracy. They are

demi-gods that the regular people should look up to. The heroes are regular but still superior to the rest of the class. The Party has utterly accepted the bourgeois idea that *mens agitat molem*: mind moves matter. Gone is the class struggle as the driving force, only heroic epics from now on. Pär Johansson writes admiringly:

> *Karl-Gustav Nilsson gave voice to the righteous feeling and showed that it's possible to rise up and speak up, even at the oppressor's own meeting*. (*Proletären* 22/3-2018)

The class is robbed of all possibility to speak (or act) for itself. As Marx wrote in *The 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte:* they cannot represent themselves, they can only be represented. the Communist Party takes the role as spokesperson - not organizer - of the class. The class becomes extras in a drama where "The slaughterer from Dalarna takes on Wallenberg" (*Proletären* 8/5-2018). For the Communist Party the working-class are not the true heroes. Instead they write statements like:

> *Jacob Wallenberg chose to answer the people's voice and a small tradie of words broke out between him and Karl Gustav Nilsson*. (*Proletären ibid*)

The people's voice? Like all bourgeois history and political thinking the individual is made to embody society and its internal struggles. Nilsson becomes the class and acts in its place. The class is indebted to Nilsson's "courage", K and Nilsson hope that *"his example will lead to more people daring to raise their voice against an unreasonable system"* (*Proletären* 31/3-2018).

Karl-Gustav Nilsson is the sun which never shall set! It is only the party media that assumes this hero-worship and slavish subservience towards Nilsson - a subservience we usually only find in the *Swedish Lady's Journal* when it reports about the royal family. Nilsson himself accepts the heroic halo - han speaks in *Proletären*: *People must start speaking up because we cannot have it this way. This whole economic system doesn't work. And then we must start somewhere and have so much balls that we dare speak up*. (*Proletären*, 31/8-2018)

Nilsson thinks he can instruct “the people” in their struggle - he seems to believe in Ks image of him as the son of the working-class that leads it to victory. But the truth is that Nilsson is nothing but a myth. It is a tale of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Nilsson hasn’t done anything to deserve the appreciation or trust of the working-class. He hasn’t sacrificed anything, not risked anything and not done a deed worth telling of. He tells us that: *“What I’ve really done is say that the emperor is naked. Every week we can read in Aftonbladet about tax evasion and directors taking bonuses and shady dealings with tax-havens. Everyone knows this, but no one says anything.” (Proletären* 31/8)

Nilsson expresses a total separation from reality. How can this noble warrior for the class missed that everyone is saying something? The whole political spectrum is against these tendencies he brings up. Even the utterly bourgeois trade union Kommunal (The Municipal Workers’ Union) protests against these phenomena. Thousands of people are active in these questions, that also we’re baked into the most important topics during the election year.

His admonition that the class should have balls also shows clearly that the party’s heroes are always men. The deep-seated macho posturing is present as always. The Party’s narrative of themselves and the class is one of men for men. In party propaganda, where Karl-Gustav Nilsson gets to represent the whole party and the whole class, it is apparent that men are the target audience. The rest of the class is uninteresting for K.

Ks brainless attempts to gain a foothold in the class by building a folk-hero for the people would mostly have been ridiculous if it wasn’t so deeply offensive. Marxism has always taught that it is the masses that make history, not the individual. That those individuals that make a mark in history can only do so because of the intensity of class struggle and are raised from this. the Communist Party completely ignores all those heroes that the working class constantly produce, that constantly actually make sacrificing and takes risks. As a counterpoint to the disgusting slaughterer romanticism we raise the example of Sarah Wägnert. An assistant nurse who risked her employment, her future chances for work and had to endure harassment from employer and colleagues when she revealed the horrific conditions at the private health care facility Polhemsgården in 1997. She is not a fabricated media hero, only a proletarian women who did what was right without

reward. Sarah Wägnert showed the way and was a real leader - thousand have been able to follow her example and the whole system for reporting mistreatment in Swedish health care is named for her (Lex Sarah).

Sarah Wägnert is not organized and not a communist. But she is one of hundreds of thousand of workers who are the real heroes in history. K.G. Nilsson has twelve articles in Proletären about him. Sarah Wägnert is mentioned once in passing in one article. Her defiance stands in complete contrast towards the Communist Party's subservience which they want to impart on the whole of the working class.

For as Mao Tse-tung once wrote: *The masses are the real heroes, while we [the communists] ourselves are often childish and ignorant.*

But K is unwilling to learn from the masses, to learn from their revolts and disobedience. They have replaced the mass line with the führerprinzip.

The corruption of anti-imperialist thought

Ever since the communist Third International was founded in 1919 with the slogan *"Workers and oppressed peoples and nations of the world, unite!",* anti-imperialism has been a cornerstone of communist politics. The Communist International can rightly be said to be the first truly global marxist movement. That today's world sees marxist parties that wages active struggle against imperialism, for national liberation and socialism can be traced back to the enormous work that started 100 years ago. Anti-imperialist politics has in its marxist incarnation always meant that workers in the heartlands of imperialism must, to realize their own liberation, support and defend the revolutionary national liberation struggle in colonial and semi-colonial nations. In this it is different from the social democratic tradition, that instead pleads to the imperialist countries should give foreign aid while imperialisms economic exploitation and military interventions continues. Communist sees it as our duty to support all peoples right to throw off imperialism.

The Communist Party has of course deviated from this correct line over the years. Far off are the days where the party conducted work to send *"Anti-aircraft cannons to North Vietnam"* and thereby actually support the armed struggle against US-imperialism. That was in 1972. In 2017 the party can at most send funds to cultural associations and write about "struggling peoples" across the globe in their newspaper. Events like the Peace Race [an annual race organized by the party affiliated sports association *Proletären FF*, translator's notes] are undeniably positive. Of course it's good that money is donated to worthy cultural or other associations in victimized countries. What it is not though, is anti-imperialism. It is the most base charity. *Proletären*s reporting from and about Venezuela, Colombia, Syria, the Philippines, China, India and the discussions that have been openly waged in their newspaper's newly minted debate page regarding the party's line in regards to Israel are all signs that K's "anti-imperialism" is skin deep.

The Communist Party has a simplistic view of what anti-imperialism is. They do admit that imperialism is the primary contradiction for the oppressed nations. But from this they draw the wrong conclusion that all liberation struggles

are the same and strike at imperialism the same way. This is not so. Lenin once said that communists:

> *…should and will support bourgeois-liberation movements in the colonies only when they are genuinely revolutionary, and when their exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited. If these conditions do not exist, the Communists in these countries must combat the reformist bourgeoisie, to whom the heroes of the Second International also belong. Reformist parties already exist in the colonial countries, and in some cases their spokesmen call themselves Social-Democrats and socialists."* (Lenin, "The Second Congress of the Communist International, 1920)

The party has missed this crucial point. That anti-imperialism must be waged on a revolutionary footing and that it is the working class that must lead this struggle as well. the Communist Party instead sees anti-imperialism as consisting of promoting every single reformist and bourgeois politician in the global south. When reporting on Venezuela, the only people whose voices are heard are uniformly almost all tied to the social-democratic PSUV. Many warm words are written about Chavez and Maduro. It is of course important to support the oppressed nations of the world to freely choose to develop without imperial interference, but this constant adulatory tone from K in regards to Venezuela and its social-democrats is beyond tiresome. K seems to have drunk the Kool-Aid that the PSUV actually means to pursue a revolution, through they participate in watering down the very word and seem to mean that revolution is building housing, providing health care and education for the poor. All very important and noble, but not measures to overthrow the rule of capital. K's anti-imperialist posturing mostly boils down to giving other social-democrats good press in Sweden. That it is Venezuela's workers, peasants and oppressed that should be supported, not the national government, is never considered.

The writings about the disarmament of FARC in Colombia is also an example of uncritical acceptance of bad politics. K probably think that the anti-imperialist politics is to act as press secretary for bad decisions and never have a critical point of view of other movement's actions. FARC's demobilization was a

failure, something that *Proletären* attempted to side-step in their article "Från djungel till valurnorna"(*From the jungle to the ballot boxes*) (*Proletären* 15/1-2018). But even they have to admit that the Santos peace treaty was mostly exploited as a chance to murder or in other ways punish the former soldiers. The hope that FARC placed in the bourgeois democratic process was simply wrong. Of course this isn't spelled out by *Proletären*. Their whole existence is also predicated on the same kind of denial of all strategic opportunities outside of the electoral process.

In regards to the question of Syria the character of the reports changes somewhat. Instead of acting as press spokesperson for social-democracy and their lies about revolutionary intents or excusing capitulating before the enemy, they here act as stalwart agents of the bourgeois Syrian government. Of course a bourgeois state doesn't "deserve" to be attacked by imperialism. This is not the question. It is the uncritical pose towards the government of Bashar al-Assad and their points of view, for example completely accepting and propagating a mostly wrongheaded criticism of certain Kurdish organizations' actions.

> *The way forward for the kurds, as a part of the Syrian people, is to turn to the Syrian government to find a common plan for the future. Then they can together stand against eventual attacks from Turkey and their allied Syrian extremist rebels.* ("Hoppfullt när Damaskus firade jul i fred - men stora hinder kvarstår", *Proletären* 4/1-2019)

Here *Proletären* flatly denies that the kurds are their own people with their own long-standing desire to build their own nation state. They also propagate the Syrian government's line, that the kurds must subordinate themselves to the Syrian state or be seen as collaborators with US-imperialism. The article also includes the following passage:

> *Thirdly, all collected experience, most of all from the kurds own history, shows the the path to independence doesn't mean alliance with imperialist great powers that whenever it suits them can abandon their "friends". Even worse is to depend on the state which more than any other is*

> *responsible for the terrorgroups al-Qaeda and IS grown and become strong in the Middle East. (idib.)*

It is highly ironic that K admonishes the kurds for "allying with imperialist great powers" when this is just what the Venezuelan PSUV and the Syrian Baath Party has done. Thus it is only wrong when the kurds do it. Which of course suits the purposes of the Syrian government quite well. That Venezuela and Syria depends on the aggressive imperialist powers Russia and China is left unremarked upon and uncriticized. But there is of course no analysis within K of what role the national bourgeoisie plays in oppressed nations. Mao Tse-tung, in his article "Analysis of Classes in Chinese Society", writes of the national bourgeois class, that it is:

> *...inconsistent in its attitude towards the Chinese revolution: they feel the need for revolution and favour the revolutionary movement against imperialism and the warlords when they are smarting under the blows of foreign capital and the oppression of the warlords, but they become suspicious of the revolution when they sense that, with the militant participation of the proletariat at home and the active support of the international proletariat abroad, the revolution is threatening the hope of their class to attain the status of a big bourgeoisie. Politically, they stand for the establishment of a state under the rule of a single class, the national bourgeoisie.*

The Syrian national bourgeoisie and Venezuelas social democrats, are not the *revolutionary element* in the liberation struggles of their respective countries. It is a wavering element that might be opposed to the US but fights strongly to end the struggle there.

The inability to use the dialectical materialist method to analyse various situations are of course nothing unique to the foreign affairs section of *Proletären*. But it has a tendency to be very clear in just that section. During 2016, when Rodrigo Duterte was inaugurated as president of the Philippines, *Proletären* wrote hopefully about Duterte. They interviewed Asterio Palima, representative from the National Democratic Front ("Filippinerna är en social vulkan på väg att explodera",

Proletären, 14/11-2016). Palima voices the opinion that Duterte is "a man of the people", that the military struggle should be disbanded and so on. *Proletären* asks no critical questions if this is actually possible. After what happened in Colombia, the New People's Army of the Philippines can consider themselves lucky that they did not disarm in return for promises of legal status.

K consistently fetishizes the legal methods of struggle, they celebrate when weapons are laid down and military conflicts "end". *Proletären* stands in solidarity with the oppressed only when the bourgeoisie leads them, when their struggles take on legal form and actually does not threaten imperialis. They have a distant cool attitude towards those parties that actually wages armed struggle around the world (the Communist Party of Peru, the Communist Party of India (Maoist), even the Communist Party of the Philippines). There was no interest at all for the People's War in Nepal until it was ended. Active struggle lead by communists is not part and parcel of what K sees as correct anti-imperialism. Instead one consistently lifts only "popular" social-democratic movements or bourgeois governments.

Ks whole line is perhaps best exemplified by two articles written by the crown prince of the party right, Nils Littorin. These opinion pieces were apparently considered so embarrassing, of course not too embarrassing to publish, but embarrassing enough to not put up on the web site. In the first of these: "Fredsprocessen är död - tvåstatslösning enda rimliga" (The peace process is dead- a two state solution is the only reasonable), published in *Proletären #24-2018* Littorin writes:

Politics isn't just about being right. It's also about being proven right. That one fro any given situation must get the most possible for one's cause. To win the moral argument that the palestinians should retake the whole of historic Palestine is not hard, The UN partition plan for Palestine, that was supported by not just the western powers but also the Soviet Union, gave in an historic injustice 56 percent of the nation to a jewish minority of only 30 percent of the total population. To create a jewish state in 1948, 800 000 palestinians were expelled from their homes by jewish forces in what we now would call an ethnic cleansing. The state of Israel was born in blood and in some cases was literally built on top of palestinian villages and homes. Of course this was wrong in every conceivable

way. Today, 70 years later, there are many who wish that it never would've happened. But not country in the world pushes for a dissolution of Israel, that today has a population of 8,5 millions (of which circa 20 percent are arabs).

Littorin goes on in the same vein, criticizing an editorial piece in *Proletären* "När våldet triumferar" (4/4-2018) as unrealistic and full of "sectarian wishful thinking". He finishes his thinkpiece by stating:

> *The alternative to a two-state solution that is supported by world opinion, the palestinian organizations, human rights organizations and by the UN, is not necessarily the one-state solution proposed by Proletären. It can all become nothing instead, a complete holocaust of the palestinian people, which the latest events in Gaza shows. (ibid)*

It comes as no surprise for us that have followed Littorin's "career" that he proposes a political line that would entail utter and total capitulation for the palestinian people. Littorin always represents the reactionary point of view, whatever question he utters himself in. This though must be considered a height of reactionary nonsense that so utterly betrays anti-imperialist principles that is a rotten shame that *Proletären* even published it. Littorin, in a cloying false concern for the palestinian people, assumes the same position as the collaborators in Fatah. It is also utterly wrong that de "palestinian organizations" support a two-state solution. Only Fatah does this - an organization shunned by the palestinian people which does not even exist in Gaza. Littorin trivializes the genocide started by Israel in 1948 which is still ongoing - he means that the palestinian people passively should accept slowly being expelled from their homeland by settler colonialists, israeli bulldozers and israeli tanks. What is Nils Littorin if not an apologist for Israel's crimes? A proponent for capitulation because the situation is difficult? One who throws principles on the scrap heap to reach popularity? He expresses that "many wish" that the al-Nakba never would have happened. He utterly ignores the over 70 years of struggle to reverse the Nakba. But Littorin is against popular struggle overall. That such a man is allowed to sit at a position of power is shameful for a party that calls itself communist.

It honors the members who criticized Littorin's foul claims. But Littorin didn't just get one opinion piece published, but two! In #27-2018 of *Proletären* Littorin wrote the article "Parallellen Sydafrika-Israel är felaktig." (The parallel between South-Africa and Israel is wrong). Once again *Proletären* presumably found the debate too embarrassing to be published online. In this opinion piece, which mostly consists of Littorin attacking a well founded comparison based on the close historical cooperation between South Africa and Israel, he also expands on his capitulation thesis.

> *Should little Palestine, without its own military or economy fight the whole world? The thought is absurd. At the same time the two-state solution has the support of almost the whole of the world, and would have been reality if not for the constant veto of the US and the israeli refusal to leave occupied territory. The task for the palestinians is to set their four millions in motion to gather the support of the world. Our duty is to get our governments through action do what they've already taken upon themselves in words - to ensure that Israel follows the resolutions of the UN. ("Parallellen Sydafrika-Israel är felaktig", Proletären #27-2018)*

Littorin utterly denies the historic examples where weak, poor peoples, managed to perform enormous feats. Russia, China, Korea, Vietnam, Mozambique, Angola, Guinea, Algeria. So on. He expresses the idealistic position that it's the "veto of the US" that prevents a solution of Israel's occupation of Palestine. He thinks that if Israel was isolated enough they would immediately surrender. He ignores here, fittingly enough, the example of South Africa, where it was armed struggle that forced the government to abandon apartheid. In a contemptuous condescending way he ignores that Palestine's millions already are in motion. Like the zionists he pretends to criticize,he considers Palestine as non-existent, it's resistance is non-existent, it's people non-existent. Then he reduces the communist's anti-imperialist work to only consist of legalist opinion raising. Here we are far away from KFML(r)'s active solidarity. If Palestine is lacking economic and military support, why not help?!

But anti-imperialism, like everything else within K, is completely tied to bourgeois premises and is therefore false, corrupted. For imperialism is capitalism's last and highest state. You cannot remove imperialism from it's origins in the capitalist relations of production. To, like Littorin, want to solve the contradictions between oppressor and oppressed through an administrative maneuver - partitioning a country that was stolen from one people by setller colonialists - is nothing less than betrayal of communism. But Littorin is the foremost representative of a political line within the party that wants to destroy the last vestiges of communism so the party instead can thoroughly dedicate itself to nationalism.

Social chauvinism

> *Firstly, Social-Democracy has everywhere and always been, and cannot but be the representative of the class-conscious, and not of the non-class-conscious, workers and that there cannot be anything more dangerous and more criminal than the demagogic speculation on the underdevelopment of the workers. If the criterion of activity were that which is immediately, directly, and to the greatest degree accessible to the broadest masses, we should have to preach anti-Semitism.* (V.I. Lenin, Burning questions of our movement. Swedish edition.)

Social chauvinism is preaching socialism, but practicing nationalism and racism. The Communist Party succumb to the very things that the communist movement as a whole was created in opposition to. To all attempts at criticism of their standpoints in the migration, asylum, and refugee questions, the party reacts with a kind of bourgeois humanism. *"In their willingness to always stand up for humanism - which is the foundation of all left-wing politics - the middle-class left has given up in a walkover in questions regarding the negative aspects of migration and has in that given the Sweden Democrats a great opportunity.",* writes the chairman of the Communist Party, Robert Mathiasson, in the editorial "What is the left doing wrong when workers are voting for the Sweden Democrats?".

We can start with saying that bourgeois humanism is seen as something positive in K, as long as it gives them an opportunity to praise and worship our bourgeois democracy, so that they can talk about its "expansion", so that they can talk about "participatory democracy", and so on in all infinity. They swallow whole the falsehood that democracy always will exist in its current, parliamentary bourgeois shape and form and that it should be expanded - a falsehood that is a kind of liberal utopia straight out of John Stuart Mill's times. But when it comes to immigration, bourgeois humanism is seen as something negative in K. In the past few years, we have witnessed a major change in their rhetoric. In 2014, August Eliasson wrote in *Proletären* about the immigration ban in Switzerland: *"The*

campaigns around the subject were dominated by the extreme right-wing Swiss People's Party reactionary incitings against immigrants." as well as *"Its* [The European Union. Our note] *open borders are only open for the movement of capital and labour, but closed for those fleeing from oppression and poverty."* Eliasson finishes off the article with the following: *"The extreme right and the racists are trying to tie together the dissatisfaction with the EU and their anti-worker-policies with what they call "mass immigration""* ("Schweiz stoppar invandring", Proletären 20/2 2014)

This indignation for the fates of the refugees have now been completely replaced. Today, *Proletären* stands at the front together with other right-wing newspapers when it comes to mistrusting refugees. "Migration is a sign of sickness in a hopeless world", is the title on an article authored by Robert Mathiasson in *Proletären* 2018. Ironically, he starts with: *" "Working men of all countries, compete!", the director Percy Barnevik once paraphrased the famous phrase from the Communist Manifesto."* (*Proletären,* 12/12 2018). Is this not the exact same play on words that the Communist Party has embraced? Is this not exactly their opinion, when they turn the Swedish working class against their newly arrived working-class brothers and sisters? Mathiasson blames the refugees for the problems that imperialism has caused - both in the imperialist nations and the global south. He writes:

> *Migration is a sign of sickness for the world. In a hopeless and individualized world, the alternative, instead of staying put and collectively fighting for a better future, becomes to emigrate and hope for one owns better future in another place.*
>
> *The consequences of the migration is that it contributes to maintaining oppression and poverty in the countries of origin - who are to fight for sovereignty and a future that is better for the poor and not only the elite, if the young and driven flee out of the country? - at the same time it weakens the class struggle in the destination of the migrant stream, when Barnevik's slogan about every worker competing becomes reality.*
> (Once again *Proletären* 12/12)

Mathiasson turns a relation between humans - migration - to a natural phenomenon. It becomes a kind of fetish much like the kind of commodity fetischism that Marx pointed out resided in bourgeois economists. There, commodities were not seen as a relation between humans, between producers, but merely as a relation between values. Mathiasson sees migration in the same way, as nothing but a destructive force which ruins the countries devastated by imperialism, as well as the imperialist countries themselves. He accuses refugees of being fortune-seeking individualists that are destroying their countries of origin as well as the countries they go to. It is patronizing in a most bourgeois way. Mathiasson takes on the role as the craft master in the early days of capitalism, when they spurred against the impoverished rural population arriving to the cities looking for work, threatening his position. Robert Mathiasson thinks that they are to stay home, in poverty, and magically, without any leadership, without any party and without any prerequisites provided just “make revolution at home”. That people actually need to *live and survive* to be able to change society is not something that Mathiasson seems to care about, but Mathiasson, as we’ve already mentioned, doesn’t see migration as a human process but merely as a flow of goods - somewhat like the bureaucracy of the EU.

It is a most reactionary stance, which was criticised as far back as in 1848, by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They called it *bourgeois socialism*:

> *The Socialistic bourgeois want all the advantages of modern social conditions without the struggles and dangers necessarily resulting therefrom. They desire the existing state of society, minus its revolutionary and disintegrating elements. They wish for a bourgeoisie without a proletariat. The bourgeoisie naturally conceives the world in which it is supreme to be the best; and bourgeois Socialism develops this comfortable conception into various more or less complete systems. In requiring the proletariat to carry out such a system, and thereby to march straightway into the social New Jerusalem, it but requires in reality, that the proletariat should remain within the bounds of existing society, but should cast away all its hateful ideas concerning the bourgeoisie.*

A second, and more practical, but less systematic, form of this Socialism sought to depreciate every revolutionary movement in the eyes of the working class by showing that no mere political reform, but only a change in the material conditions of existence, in economical relations, could be of any advantage to them. By changes in the material conditions of existence, this form of Socialism, however, by no means understands abolition of the bourgeois relations of production, an abolition that can be affected only by a revolution, but administrative reforms, based on the continued existence of these relations; reforms, therefore, that in no respect affect the relations between capital and labour, but, at the best, lessen the cost, and simplify the administrative work, of bourgeois government.

Bourgeois Socialism attains adequate expression when, and only when, it becomes a mere figure of speech.

Free trade: for the benefit of the working class. Protective duties: for the benefit of the working class. Prison Reform: for the benefit of the working class. This is the last word and the only seriously meant word of bourgeois socialism.

It is summed up in the phrase: the bourgeois is a bourgeois — for the benefit of the working class.
(Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto,* page 31, https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/download/pdf/Manifesto.pdf)

They protest migration as if it was a lacerating, dissolving element. They protest the harms created by capitalism, and want to stop it by any means, except for abolishing capitalism. The Communist Party opposes immigration, for the welfare of the working classes! They even go so far as to say that this is an proletarian internationalist action!

The answer to this is proletarian internationalism. Where it being proletarian is about a common struggle for workers and poor people in different countries. It is about us realising that we have common interests

> *in fighting the current order and supporting each other in this struggle. (Proletären*, 12/12)

This is an absurd and offensive way to speak of proletarian internationalism. We will begin to make our point by quoting Lenin:

> *The bourgeoisie incites the workers of one nation against those of another in the endeavour to keep them disunited. Class-conscious workers, realising that the break-down of all the national barriers by capitalism is inevitable and progressive, are trying to help to enlighten and organise their fellow-workers from the backward countries. (Lenin, "Capitalism* and Workers' Immigration")

Mathiasson doesn't seem to see the possibility that different parts of the working classes can unite. He seems to see, as we've already shown, the migrating parts of the working classes as a natural disaster, that we as communists can't and shouldn't, organise. He makes too great of a point the etymological fact that "internationalism" stems from "inter-natione" (between nations). But he forgets, as Lenin accused all opportunists of forgetting, the "fleeting nature of the national state". There are no reasons for us communists to defend the bourgeois national state, and there are no reasons for us to believe that it must be strengthened in order for us to fully commit to internationalistic policies. Mathiasson submits to an idea which is rotten to the core, for his idea means total surrender before capitalism and right-wing extremism. They mean that the bourgeois state should intervene and put an end to capitalist accumulation - the very process by which the capital gains its profits, the very process that is the backbone of our current society. Mathiasson never explains how this could ever be possible without abolishing the bourgeois state and capitalism. Instead, he, and other representatives of K, has embraced the rhetoric and political stratagems of the Sweden Democrats.

They argue that they do it in order to reach the working class - the class that Mathiasson, in his article about the left and the Sweden Democrats, argues have been abandoned. That members of the working class are voting for the Sweden Democrats is seen by him as a sign of approval for their policies. Closed borders and less immigration. The Communist Party desperately tries to explain and

motivate these policies from a leftist point of view, by talking about "importing labour forces". August Eliasson writes the following in an article called "The UN's framework for migration - a system for guest workers labeled as humanism" in *Proletären:*

> *None of the suggestions in the proposed framework demands freedom of movement for labour, in the sense of open borders. It is the contrary, they want to be able to regulate and control it - supply it depending on their own demand of cheap and flexible labour. And this is just what the UN's framework for migration will do for them, regardless of any humanist lacquer.*

In an interview with Birgitta Elfström, *Proletären* argued: *"border controls and more collaboration is needed for controlled immigration"* (the title of the interview), and *"We should make sure that there are no refugees! We shouldn't sell weapons. We shouldn't nourish regimes that imprison their opposition and journalists. We need to take care of the problem. Not just mend the wounds."*

The Communist Party, who wants to "freeze" immigration into Malmö (this opinion was expressed in an article in *Sydsvenskan, "*Det small två gånger på två dagar*",* 10/12 2018 by Nils Littorin, the infamous chairman of K-Malmö and member of the central committee of the Communist Party) also want to put an end to importing labour. They aggressively argue that all criticism of this idea is "identity politics" and a bourgeois attempt to demonise them.

If we deconstruct this argument, we can see its faults on multiple levels. Once again, K partakes in a bourgeois fetishism of commodities where they see labour-power as something not in any way embodied by humans. They fail to see how such a ban undeniably is connected with restrictive and deadly policies on immigration and asylum-granting which only helps create the problems K want to work towards resolving. Harsher laws force people to go underground, to become what we in Sweden call paperless, where they can be fully exploited by capital. Regardless of what K thinks - the bourgeois state won't stop the bourgeois process of accumulation of capital. People being displaced is not a trend that will fade away, and we can't stop it with fences and border guards. Ever since Marx wrote his

works on economics, Marxists have known that the displacement of people, making people unable to live off of their own means, forcing them to seek wage-labour, is a central part of how the working class is created. See the chapter "*Primitive Accumulation*" in the first volume of *the Capital.* But the Communist Party doesn't have a marxist analysis. They don't see the working class as having a position in a defined order of production, they don't see it as something that constantly is recreated and repopulated.

In a column about the Left Party representatives Ali Esbati and Aron Etzler, a member of the editorial committee of *Proletären* writes the following:

> *There's a notion within the less class-like* (Translator's note: the original word used is "klassbetonade", the meaning of which should be interpreted as "looking like", or "appearing like" a member of a certain class. In this context, that class is the working class.) *left that demanding an end to the importing of labour is to "fish in brown waters"* (Translator's note: a play on words with the original idiom, to "fish in troubled waters". "Brown" here is a reference to fascism.). *It's seen as a way of accommodating the policies of the Sweden Democrats. In reality, it's the other way around. It's the left that abandoned the question of labour imports that accommodates the Sweden Democrats. Their compulsive struggle to always disagree with the Sweden Democrats have instead placed them on the same side as the capital.* (*Proletären,* 4/1-2019)

That K are "fishing in brown waters" is obvious - especially to the Sweden Democrat-sympathisers that K have made their primary audience. This is reflected in a letter to the editor published in *Proletären* with the title "The dialogue with the Sweden Democrats could have been better." (*Proletären,* 2/1-2019). There, the author writes about a Sweden Democrat they met, that *"turned out to be completely correct in all fears about immigration. When the concrete material reality caught up to me I realised that the worries the Sweden Democrats have raised about work, housing, cultural clashes, criminality and rapes in all cases were reflected in reality."*

The letter continues:

And then I think that the dialogue between Jenny and Jonny could have been entirely different if Jenny would have said: "We in the Communist Party are also opposed to immigration". And that dialogue would have been very interesting to read."

This letter claims that it is immigration (not importing labour, *immigration*) that is to blame for the assaults that the the working classes have had to endure for decades before the so called "refugee crisis" of 2015. Jenny Tedjezas (the editor in chief of *the Proletarian*) answer consists of only one points: *that even the Sweden Democrats' nationalism is unreliable.*

It is apparent, even to *Proletären* themselves, that they are "fishing in brown waters". They, without any attempt at criticism, chose to publish a letter that claims that immigration (and not capitalism) is responsible for cut-downs in the public sector, unemployment, segregation and rape. A letter that claims that it was wrong to protest the movement which was then called *Keep Sweden Swedish*. The letter is allowed to, completely unhindered, spread the racist myth that men with ethnic backgrounds from places other than Sweden are responsible for women being raped. Tedjezas only reflection is that the letter was right and that she should have agreed with the Sweden Democrat in the question of immigration.

K's line in the matter is nothing more than a collection of nauseating right-wing conspiracy theories dressed up in the guise of being "pro-worker".

Since K have, so very much, corrupted the word "class", it is important to once again define it, but this time from a marxist point of view. Lenin concluded the following in the article "A Great Beginning":

Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can

appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy.

The class is not merely a *category* but a *position*. To be part of the working class is not about thinking certain things or holding certain opinions, it is about one's *relation* to *the means of production*. Are those, who have established themselves in Sweden, who through their position in relation to the production must face the fact that they must sell their labour to another person, are those people not working class? Of course they are. But the Communist Party doesn't see these people as part of the class they represent - they are seen as lumpenproletariat or criminal, and must be controlled.

That people are moved according to how much the capital are in need of them, regardless of how distraught Mathiasson is over that fact, is nothing new. The Communist Party's take on this is only about trying to reach the backwards parts of the working class. They are assimilating and embracing the politics of the Sweden Democrats in a desperate attempt to claim their voters. The fact that they aren't trying to reach the parts of the working class that aren't voting for the Sweden Democrats, or the fact that they aren't trying to reach the parts of the working class that actively engages in matters of anti-fascism and anti-racism, that is part of the Communist Party's ideological breakdown. They see all active anti-racism and all active humanism as bourgeoisie actions, and reject those who have engaged in such activities.

In a movement that doesn't accept revolutionary criticism against the labour union movement, that is heavily invested in making sure that it's members are good and loyal members of unions, that sees labour unions as organisations meant for revolutionary struggle, no one realised that the LO-unions (Translator's note: the major unions, organising around 40-50% of union members in Sweden) *doesn't* want to strengthen border checks, or limit immigration. The Communist Party doesn't root their politics in the working class, like they constantly claim to - they use the working class as a rhetorical tool to justify making policies that actually harm the working

classes. Those who seek refuge in Sweden, who are fleeing from something, and those who come here as "imported labour" - they are part of the working class in Sweden, too! If we look at the demographics in the largest working group in Sweden, those working in the public sector, the aforementioned groups make up a clear majority. Instead of demanding equal and fair pay for all workers in Sweden, healthy working environments and good terms, the Communist Party wants to solve this using an administrative maneuver - those who aren't receiving fair pay should leave Sweden. Following the same line of thought, we should expel women from the labour market as well, as they are going to be next in line for lower pay. But this is nothing new - it is something that have happened countless times during the history of the working class movement.

Marx and Engels were huge opponents to pitting parts of the working class against each other. In a letter, Marx writes:

> *And most important of all! Every industrial and commercial centre in England now possesses a working class divided into two hostile camps, English proletarians and Irish proletarians. The ordinary English worker hates the Irish worker as a competitor who lowers his standard of life. In relation to the Irish worker he regards himself as a member of the ruling nation and consequently he becomes a tool of the English aristocrats and capitalists against Ireland, thus strengthening their domination over himself. He cherishes religious, social, and national prejudices against the Irish worker. His attitude towards him is much the same as that of the "poor whites" to the Negroes in the former slave states of the U.S.A.. The Irishman pays him back with interest in his own money. He sees in the English worker both the accomplice and the stupid tool of the English rulers in Ireland.*
>
> (Letter to S. Meyer and A. Vogt, 1870)

We see here that Marx and Engels admits, like the party, the divisive effects of immigration. The difference is that Marx and Engels, like proper revolutionaries, doesn't blame the "receiving country's" working class resentment of the immigrated proletariat on the immigrants. Instead, they observe the effects of ideology, how the

English workers see themselves as “members of the ruling nation”. Xenophobia and racism doesn’t become twisted or distorted to mean class consciousness or rebelliousness - it is a factor which prevents the development of the working class into a revolutionary force.

It’s not a surprise then that the Communist Party, who have completely abandoned any attempt at rational analysis can’t analyse the different strata of the working class, and how they can pull in different directions. They can’t analyse contradictions within the working class, and instead see the working class as something static. The Revisionist Party deprives Marxism-Leninism of its living soul, the dialectic understanding of the role that contradictions play in the development of ideology.

Marxists have *never* assumed that the working class is monolithic in nature, enjoying perfect unity and harmony in thought and opinion. To think so is an utterly idiotic bourgeoisie sociological perception. A perception that belongs best amongst statisticians who define classes in terms of income and living conditions - not as a position in relation to the means of production.

In “Once More on the Social-Democratic Deviation in our Party“, comrade Stalin wrote:

> *They are, secondly, the heterogeneity of the working class, the existence of different strata within the working class. I think that the proletariat, as a class, can be divided into three strata.*
>
> *One stratum is the main mass of the proletariat, its core, its permanent part, the mass of "pure-blooded" proletarians, who have long broken off connection with the capitalist class. This stratum of the proletariat is the most reliable bulwark of Marxism.*
>
> *The second stratum consists of newcomers from non-proletarian classes—from the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie or the intelligentsia. These are former members of other classes who*

have only recently merged with the proletariat and have brought with them into the working class their customs, their habits, their waverings and their vacillations. This stratum constitutes the most favourable soil for all sorts of anarchist, semi-anarchist and "ultra-Left" groups.

The third stratum, lastly, consists of the labour aristocracy, the upper stratum of the working class, the most well-to-do portion of the proletariat, with its propensity for compromise with the bourgeoisie, its predominant inclination to adapt itself to the powers that be, and its anxiety to "get on in life." This stratum constitutes the most favourable soil for outright reformists and opportunists.

It is this last strata that the Communist Party is trying to make moves on. A strata, which due to their material well-being are more inclined to work with the capital. The strata which march against refugees and immigrants, because it perceives them as a threat to their relatively privileged position. The Communist Party doesn't take it upon themselves to criticise this - on the contrary they see it as something to embrace. Here, they won't find that Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin or Mao or any great thinker agree with them. Engels, for example, once wrote the following in a letter to Marx:

...The English proletariat is actually becoming more and more bourgeois, so that this most bourgeois of all nations is apparently aiming ultimately at the possession of a bourgeois aristocracy and a bourgeois proletariat alongside the bourgeoisie. For a nation which exploits the whole world this is of course to a certain extent justifiable.
(quoting Engels, from Lenin's *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism,* 1916).

Here we with no doubt see that the working class in imperialist countries, due to the very nature of imperialist exploitation, can enjoy the spoils and become infected with bourgeoisie thought. The Reactionary Party won't recognise any such tendency, it feels that there is no need to analyse the working class as something fractured and divided. They only recognise it in order to excuse themselves when

they then once more throw themselves into the usual fits of opportunism where they bend to the whim of the working class aristocracy.

Engels provided a more correct view of the situation when he, in the preface to the 1892 english edition of *Condition of the Working Class in England* wrote about the importance of the:

> *...revival of the East End of London. That immense haunt of misery is no longer the stagnant pool it was six years ago. It has shaken off its torpid despair, has returned to life, and has become the home of what is called the "New Unionism," that is to say, of the organisation of the great mass of "unskilled" workers. This organisation may to a great extent adopt the form of the old Unions of "skilled" workers but it is essentially different in character. The old Unions preserve the traditions of the time when they were founded, and look upon the wages system as a once-for-all established, final fact, which they at best can modify in the interest of their members. The new Unions were founded at a time when the faith in the eternity of the wages system was severely shaken; their founders and promoters were Socialists either consciously or by feeling; the masses, whose adhesion gave them strength, were rough, neglected, looked down upon by the working-class aristocracy; but they had this immense advantage, that their minds were virgin soil, entirely free from the inherited "respectable" bourgeois prejudices which hampered the brains of the better situated "old" Unionists. And thus we see now these new Unions taking the lead of the working-class movement generally, and more and more taking in tow the rich and proud "old" Unions. Undoubtedly, the East Enders have committed colossal blunders; so have their predecessors, and so do the doctrinaire Socialists who pooh-pooh them. A large class, like a great nation, never learns better or quicker than by undergoing the consequences of its own mistakes. And for all the faults committed in past, present and future, the revival of the East End of London remains one of the greatest and most fruitful facts of this fin de siècle, and glad and proud I am to have lived to see it.*
> (Engels, Condition of the Working Class in England)

How different is this not from the Communist Party - who completely cast aside our modern Swedish versions of East End, calling them hives of criminality instead? The Communist Party is our modern Swedish version of the doctrinaire socialists who, so to say, pooh-pooh people. In this, the Communist Party show their aristocratic condescending attitude towards the working masses in Sweden. The masses who can't have a revolution, the masses who can't educate themselves. The masses who want nothing but higher wages, a functioning welfare society, a "participatory democracy", and that the police should protect their property and beat people in the suburbs. That is not the will of the masses. That is the will of the Communist Party, and the working class aristocrats who inspire them, who think that this is what the people want.

We, who are marxists, that believe in spreading our revolutionary message, that believe that the economic struggle of the working class will never evolve into socialist consciousness by itself, that believe that we must organise the working class through political struggle and political organising in order for them to reach it, are often called secterists and elitists.

But it is the opportunists who are the true elitists. They who think of the working class as something stupid, something backwards, narrow-minded. They who think that the only thing the working class could possibly want is more pay and larger subsidies. They who accept racism, and embrace it as a sign of progressive discontent. They who won't try to resolve contradictions in the working class. They who expect nothing more than that the working class will quietly submit to the rule of capitalism until, magically and by itself, there comes a revolution.

This elitism is reflected in the outward-facing material published by the Communist Party, which doesn't petition the working class, but instead pleads for different governmental organisations to take action in solving our problems. As an example, we can point to the whole "*Proud Worker*"-campaign that the party launched during the election run-up. A slogan that is said to be aimed towards the proudness of the working class, but really does the opposite. With their "proudness", they want to assert themselves against politicians, decision-makers and capitalists. They want to make their voices heard, and something that should be taken seriously. Amongst the working class, this slogan is absurd. "Proud

Worker"? What is there to be proud about - the oppression, the exploitation? Should the jaded home care workers take comfort in their pride, as a substitute for healthy working conditions. In such context the absurd characteristics of the slogan becomes clear: to be a proud worker is nothing more than to be the lap dog of your boss - the happy worker who can take shit, and is proud of their underpaid, crappy work. The others, who would much rather quit but lack the opportunity (because who would want to employ an older lady outside of the healthcare sector?), can only look upon these proud workers with *contempt*. Saboteurs who denies them their discontent and rebellion.

This slogan entirely incorporates the working class into a capitalist discipline - the capital would much rather have proud workers, instead of fighting workers. They would much rather have workers who cherish their professional pride more than fighting for their class. But the Communist Party, who internally mirrors and copies capitalist discipline, where one has to shut up and obey, can't relate to the working class' contempt towards the state and the capital. The "Proud Workers" of the Communist Party reek of the kind of guild-mentality that dominated the English workers movement during the 1800's, a mentality that was deeply criticised by Engels:

> *They are the organisations of those trades in which the labour of Grown-up men predominates, or is alone applicable. Here the competition neither of women and children nor of machinery has so far weakened their organised strength. The engineers, the carpenters and joiners, the bricklayers, are each of them a power, to that extent that, as in the case of the bricklayers and bricklayers' labourers, they can even successfully resist the introduction of machinery. That their condition has remarkably improved since 1848 there can be no doubt, and the best proof of this is in the fact that for more than fifteen years not only have their employers been with them, but they with their employers, upon exceedingly good terms. They form an aristocracy among the working class; they have succeeded in enforcing for themselves a relatively comfortable position, and they accept it as final. They are the model working men of Messrs. Leone Levi & Giffen (and also the worthy Lujo Brentano), and they are*

> *very nice people indeed nowadays to deal with, for any sensible capitalist in particular and for the whole capitalist class in general.*
> (Engels, Condition of the Working Class in England)

But as the Communist Party base themselves entirely on the working class aristocracy, base themselves entirely in their "struggle" to keep their relatively privileged positions (therefore they oppose asylum for refugees, therefore they oppose "importing labour", therefore they completely ignore all of the working class that is not part of their privileged minority), and like all opportunists and social chauvinists host a deep contempt for the real masses of the working class, the Communist Party will never be able to go past their kind of shallow *"Proud Worker"*-politics. The aristocracy who exhort and pity the contemptuous masses.

It is wrong to rebel!

The question of rebellion is always important for communists. Mao Tse-tung wrote that *"Marxism comprises many principles, but in the final analysis they can all be brought back to a single sentence:* ***it is right to rebel****."*

The Communist Party in Sweden's view on rebelliousness and revolts is an ambiguous one. In K's view revolts should be completely sublimated to the prevailing bourgeois democratic ways to be considered legitimate. Every spontaneous expression of rebelliousness that is *not* neat and tidy as well as within the bourgeois-democratic framework is immediately discarded. At the same time K happily uses revolutionary romanticism when it suits them. *"The people need guillotines"* Ulf Nilsson, trade union secretary in K, writes in an article with the same name ("Folket behöver giljotiner") published on their webpage, about the yellow vest protests in France. Apparently the people only need guillotines to *"break the crippling silence of powerlessness. Then we can defend the right to strike, abolish the unfair pension system, stop the ghettoisation of the labour market, restore the welfare state and once for all prevent the billionaires' plunder of the country."*

Revolt is only a symbolic action. A social democratic view on "rebellion" where they are "good" because they force the rulers to enact reforms. That France through it's guillotines once actually overthrew the *Ancien Régime* and the nobility's class rule is nothing they take note of. It is only the tame repetition of the yellow vests.

The two phenomena which K has determined are important revolts by "the people" in the last decade are the UK's referendum to leave the EU and the yellow vest movement. How K has written about these two events, as well as what they *haven't* written about, is of great importance. They are therefore appropriate as a sort of "case study" of K's view of rebellion in the 2010s.

Brexit

To analyze the phenomena of Brexit itsn't something many have attempted to do. Most of the referendum and the following process of the UK leaving the EU has mostly consisted of emotional tantrums. *Long live Brexit!* ("Leve Brexit!) said *Proletären* 15/6 2016. In this question, in contrast to many others, they actually dare to accuse the Left Party. *Proletären* writes of Jonas Sjöstedt (The leader of the Left Party):

> *He motivates his refusal [of endorsing Brexit] by the fact that the British anti-EU campaign involves bourgeois and purely xenophobic forces. That is true. But should that be an argument of instead making common cause with finance capital and the political establishment whose promotion of EU and rightist policies has sown the field for right populist parties?* ("Leve Brexit" *Proletären* 15/6-2016).

> It is very apparent that K thinks that the xenophobic forces after all are mostly right and therefore are somewhat progressiva. It is very unusual for K to even admit that xenophobia was a force in the Vote Leave campaign. Directly after the referendum, this aspect was blown away. In the article "Seger för Brexit!" [Victory for Brexit] (23/6-2016) *Proletären* writes, giddy with success, that "Resistance to the EU lives among the people" and *"The British exit opens the door for a liberation for Europe's workers and the European countries, to free themselves from the chokehold that the EU of the elite has meant for decades, which has prevented tradunionist and political advances in working-class and national interest."*

The rhetoric makes one think that Britain's workers have crushed the bourgeois state and established the dictatorship of the proletariat. At least when it isn't speaking about Europe's nations as oppressed, which is a traditional right-wing analysis of the situation. The bourgeois national state completely coincide with the interests of the working class. Class struggle becomes national struggle between the EU and Europe's countries. Yet another rhetorical maneuver to attract reactionary members of the class. Despite the bombastic rhetoric Brexit consisted of a simple referendum. A referendum mostly motivated by the then

prime minister of the UK David Camerons attempt to keep his Conservative party united, which was being torn asunder by factional warfare between a neoliberal and nationalist faction. *Proletären* came, in the years following, to concoct a fairytale of Brexit as the working-class' rebellion. In an editorial piece with the title "Learn from Brexit" ("Lär av Brexit" 26/9-2018), they write: *it was the working-class which voted Leave. It was the people in the peripheries that voted Leave. It was people in the urban centers, who have benefited from finance capital and EU-policies that voted Remain.*

Statistics for this statement? What data is the source for this analysis? Which statistical data, what analysis of the situation in the UK that midsummer 2016? The truth is much more complex.

It was not a united working-class that voted Leave. There were large differences between urban and rural voting patterns, yes. But the urban populace also include working-class people, mostly consisting of Brits with immigrant backgrounds who overwhelmingly tended to vote Remain. Mostly for purely defensive reasons, as they correctly saw how the racist rhetoric was geared to them. The following, by *Proletären* never thoroughly acknowledged, racist and xenophobic violence, has given this populace much credence to their suspicions. It must be seen as typical of K to dismiss all stratification within the class and to dismiss all reasons for people not voting Leave as people having "benefited for finance capital and EU:s policies". But reality of course is never complex for the Communist Party, who live in a manichean world of simple solutions and the moralism of a fairytale. The Good Brexit versus the Wicked Witch of the EU. Where is reality? With its class conflicts, stratifications and the impact of imperialism on british society? That the once foremost empire in the world, that already Marx and Engels remarked upon as having affected the British working-class, voted to leave the EU because of almost only nationalist reasons. Vote Leave handed out flyers which said "Are you British or European?" and "Is Britain getting too crowded?". That little wing of "left exiters" must soberly be considered as inefficient. The transport union RMT, very celebrated by K, told *Proletären* through it's representative Alex Gorden: *That the Leave-campaign was lead by reactionaries was the reason that we decided to gather leftist organisations to give progressive*

and socialist arguments for leaving the EU. ("De brittiska arbetarna har sett vad EU står för", *Proletären* 29/6-2016)

Sounds great - but the road to hell is paved with good intentions. A critical analysis of this leftist strategy must actually admit it as utterly failed. It was not the Left Exit which was strengthened by Brexit. Instead people flocked to the social-democratic Labour Party. Racist and xenophobic violence increased. RMT and Lexit showed themselves as incapable of handling this. Like *Proletären* they thought it unworthy of discussion.

The united working-class against capital and their petit-bourgeois interlopers is a myth. According to a study by Thomas Sampson with the title "Brexit: The Economics of International Disintegration" published in the *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, only 33 % of the UK's asian populace and only 27 % of its black populace voted Leave. Because of imperialism and racial stratification, these groups dominate the working-class in Great Britain. The same study also found that one of the strongest reasons for voting Leave wasn't economic in character, but based in resistance to immigration. Demographics also show that the whole of Scotland, one of the most economically devastated areas of the country, voted to Remain, which punctures a whole in the argument that the vulnerable voted Leave. K's arguments are mostly based on what they *want* to be true. De want Brexit to be the working-class' "sucker-punch against the EU" where *"it is the liberal left that talks of racism and whips up a frenzy. It is they who make websites where one can report all kinds of things and call them hate crimes"* ("Brexit är en fet käftsmäll för EU", *Proletären* 28/9-2016). We must remark on the conspiratorial line of thinking which we mean is typical of K. All reported instances of racial violence is apparently made up by a mean spirited liberal left. Nuances and the possibilities of viewing the event dialectically disappear. A phenomena is either wholly progressive or wholly reactionary. *There is no alternative*, as Margaret Thatcher was fond of saying.

The celebration of Brexit is revealing of K's view of the working-class and it's resistance. "The working-class" is a monolith without internal contradictions. Everything "the working-class" does must be defended and all criticism of phenomena lead by "the working-class" is mean spirited and comes from "the

liberal left" or "the petit-bourgeoisie". Once K criticizes liberals of contempt of the masses - for example Birgitta Ohlsson (a leading Swedish liberal, translator's note) once said that the referendum meant that Pandora's box had been opened. The years after Brexit where leaving the union hasn't been realized, has lead to calls for a new referendum. In their editorial piece "Learn from Brexit", *Proletären* writes: *Referendums have, in EU newspeak, gotten a new meaning: People are allowed to vote as long as they vote as the powerful want them to.*

Typically the Communist Party forgets that *every referendum functions in this way*. If voting changed anything, they'd abolish it, as the saying goes. K also has a peculiar ability to change their opinion rather abruptly. In 2016 referendums were good and all opponents thereof hated the masses. In 2018, then arguing for another referendum is hating the masses. If *Proletären* is so convinced of the united working-class voting Leave - why this anxiety about voting another time? Why does K, these idolizers of "participatory democracy", suddenly accept the bourgeois notion that referendums happen once and then their results are sacrosanct. Blown away is the rhetoric that there is too little democracy and we need more. A large, pressing matter can only be tried once.

In the end, Brexit was neither a rebellion nor a sucker-punch against the EU. It was mostly a question of migrations in the aftermath of the refugee crisis of 2015. K's parliamentary cretinism is once again exposed - the only forms of rebellion are to go the polls and cast your vote. Activity thereafter is not important. We finish this section with a quote from the British musician and author Akala:

> *I also think the public should be deeply suspicious as to why we are being asked our opinions on this particular issue when we were not asked regarding austerity, the bankers bailout or Iraq, Libya, Syria in fact clear and massive public opposition was actually actively ignored as with countless other issues.*
>
> *So whilst I am pro-remain, just about and with great reservations and no illusions about what that actually means; it's a vote for the current neo-liberal status quo –I admit that this is a coke and pepsi style choice, organic non-gmo orange juice is not an option. The British Nation State is*

not some anti neo-liberal social alternative to the EU; in fact the UK was the pioneer of neo-liberal economics in Europe and the city of London remains the center of European finance.

There is of course a progressive people led anti-austerity, anti corporatist, anti-imperialist case for leaving the EU and if that strain of argument were even close to an audible voice in the campaign and if our current political trajectory was not one of the most regressive in the Union I may have well been swayed to join the leavers. But as it has played out the leave lot have appealed to good old fashion fear of the 'other' to rile up support for their cause at a time when the 'others' are being left to drown in the sea in droves, sensitive humane stuff.
(Akala, "My thoughts on the EU referendum",
http://illastate.posthaven.com/my-thoughts-on-the-eu-referendum
[accessed 2019-01-07]

Akala here raises an interesting option that no one in Lexit or K considered. That a more correct option for uniting the working-class could be to actually boycott an election. If the alternatives are Pepsi or Coca Cola, why not abstain? But K of course doesn't understand any political work that doesn't result in parliamentary representation.

In the case of Brexit contradictions within the working-class was denied, it's different segment which were pulling in different directions. The party promoted an parliamentary and bourgeois line, where participation in a referndum became not a tactic but a sacred cow. The party even contradicted its own craze for bourgeois democracy to defend Brexit. The Party built a moralist tale of class struggle with the Good Witch of the United Working Class versus The Evil Witches of the EU and the Middle Class Lackeys. Any attempt at a deeper understanding was liberal and incorrect. The conclusion is once again the party cannot navigate in a correct way and draws the wrong conclusions. K wants to pursue a similar EU-criticism in Sweden. They will use the same nationalist agenda to turn the working-class against each other, completely deny or trivialize the violence our non-white class-brothers and sisters experience. The fight against the EU is completely divorced from the struggle for socialism. Despite the fact that a Sweden outside of the EU would never

stop being a bourgeois imperialist state. But then again, K doesn't have a thought about socialism. Leaving the EU is only about re-establishing the social-democratic glorious years.

The yellow vests

The movement which began during the autumn of 2018 in France's capital of Paris was meant by general frenzy from K's media. "In the yellow vests we see our time's revolt", the editorial piece of Proletären 6/12-2018 read. Once again Proletären crowns this a working-class rebellion:

It is regular people from all over France who have taken to the streets. It is the rural populations' revolt against the urban elite. It is the French working-class, from countryside, small towns and suburbs who are depending on their car to make their daily life possible, who for so long been tormented by the neoliberal politics' contempt for regular people's lives and well-being. ("I de gula västarna ser vi vår tids revolt", *Proletären*)

Proletären themselves make the connection to Brexit, so let us do the same. The yellow vests are a non-political protest movement that refuses organisation and promotes sporadic reforms. This "rebellion from beneath" that *Proletären* hails is no recent or new phenomena. Protest movements appear constantly within capitalism. Eight years ago we had the Occupy movement which was almost identical. Same contempt for political work, the same unwillingness to stable organisation and the same sort of movement romance. It has been called *Movementism,* this belief that movements are cumulative and one is piled on the next till the great rebellion arrives and capitalism is overthrown. It never happens.

"The questions that raises fury are more about the questions' symbolic meaning than its actual content. They are questions that most decidely symbolize the elite's unwillingness to take responsibility for their own country's and people's needs." writes *Proletären* in the article from 6/12. Once again class struggle is replaced by struggle for the nation state, for a responsible bourgeoisie that cares for their nation and their people. The discussion about symbols make us dizzy - did we somehow end up in an article by a French postmodernist where language and

symbols are more important than our actual lives? But then of course - to K the working-class is just a symbol. So it's not that bizarre that they're starting to sound like semioticians.

In the article "Ta från de rika, ge till de fattiga. Här är gula västarnas krav för ett rättvist Frankrike" [Take from the earlthy and give to the poor - here are the yellow vests' demands for a just France] (*Proletären* 8/12-2018) K completely endorses a program which includes demands for deportation of everyone who doesn't get their asylum request granted and demands that migrants must "become French". But as earlier showcased, K has a completely moralist interpretation of all struggle. A movement with progressive *elements* becomes thoroughly progressive and by default morally good, which means it must be defended at all costs.

That the yellow vests are a very loosely defined movement, with no apparent homogenous class composition and without larger goals than a few reforms, which mixes progressive and reactionary demands, is a huge weakness. That the working-class must assume the leadership role in the struggle against capital does not mean that it automatically does so. K has a pubescent political viewpoint wherein all protests always are left therefore always progressive therefore always good. Sure it would've been nice and simple if that was the case. But it is an utterly idealistic interpretation devoid of what we call *reality*.

On riots

So far we have seen that K only acknowledges protests and "rebellions" as progressive or rebellious if they are totally sublimated to bourgeois parliamentarism, or if they only pursue reformist demands without larger goal. How do they then perceive spontaneous struggles, especially those that exist outside the bourgeois-democratic framework?

Riots are legitimate, if inefficient, expression of rage. Primarily directed against the bourgeois state and it's most noticeable representatives, the police. So it was in Great Britain in 2011 and i the Stockholm suburb of Husby in 2013. *Proletären* commented on both. That people are willing to fight the bourgeois state, that their spontaneous consciousness is developed enough that they correctly

identify the source of their vulnerability - the bourgeoisie embodied in the state - should be seen as a net positive by communists, right? But the Communist Party has no regard for these rebellions.

> *Riots like these are apolitical acts, an expression that poor people are denied alternatives of action and thus become victims of their own and their children's' destructive frustration. So it is, sadly. (*"Storbritannien: Kollektiv kamp istället för upplopp" *Proletären* 19/8-2011)

K assumes the same admonishing position and the same condescending attitude towards the working-class of Britain as any social-democrat. They reduce the class to victims that don't know better, that must be disciplined and taught to act correctly. It is highly ironic that *Proletären* in the next parapgraph write:

> *With that said, causality remains. Prime minister David Cameron and his morally conservative cheerleaders in Sweden have their answer ready. The riots are not grounded in racism and poverty, but that society - and the families - have failed to make it clear what is right and what is wrong. It is the thieves' moral that explodes in the riots and it is that which must be met with mass arrests, long prison sentences and public shaming of suspected hooligans. (19/8-2011)*

This is exactly what K mean! That the riots are caused by people who don't know better, who don't understand that it is meaningless. The same condescending liberalism that prime minister Cameron represents. When K attempt to explain the riots they of course must throw in a caveat: *To analyse the riots in their social and political context is not to defend vandalism or looting, just explaining that which has happened. (ibid.)*

How do these neighborhood revolutionaries think that the revolution will be made without acts of violence? Without vandalism or looting? The bourgeoisie will see it as the utmost vandalism to destroy the state that serves them, the utmost looting to take their property, their businesses and their wealth. This denial of violence tries to be reasonable but only becomes a denial of all violent reorganization of society. At the end of "Kollektiv kamp istället för upplopp" they

write: *If the social frustration can be channeled through collective, including political struggle against the society which brings only hopelessness to ever more people, riots kan be turned to rebellion and social change.*

We have seen how rebellion for K mean that all frustration is channeled into the bourgeois parliaments, into struggle that doesn't threaten the rule of capital. Only that struggle is legitimate. When the spectre of another form of struggle appears, they shudder back. They should accuse themselves with the same words they throw at the rest of the left: *when the revolt doesn't look like in the school books it is better to wait to not risk to fall in with bad company.* (*Proletären* 6/12-2018)

We can decidedly see that in practice K denies the famous definition by Mao of what constitutes the core of marxism: that it is right to rebel. They call various phenomena rebellions sure, but in practice it all peters out into "it is right to protest" or "it is right to speak up." Any bourgeois person can agree to that. If someone does rise up, does rebell, perhaps a Stockholm suburb or british suburbs, then admonishments galore.

The stupid and unthoughtful working-class doesn't know its own best and wastes its time with worthless gestures of struggle. K reduces struggle against the state to childish frustration. K is on the side of reasonable calm. Exactly the same disciplinary rhetoric used by the Social-Democrats when the class is more rebellious then they want.

For K, their "marxism" (their parody thereof) can be said to consist of many "principles" but in the final analysis they all come down to one single sentence: *it is wrong to rebel!*

Closing remarks

She gave us everything.
Sun and wind, unsparingly
Wherever she was, there was life,
Whatever we are, we are through her
She has never abandoned us
When the world froze, we were warm
The mother of the masses protects us
Her powerful arm carries us

Oh The Party, The Party is always right
And comrade,
may it ever be so!

- *Lied der partei, Ernst Busch*

Like the Socialist Unity Party of the GDR, there's a vague, romantic shimmer surrounding the Communist Party, which at one time were called the Communist Party Marxist-Leninist (revolutionaries). This romantic shimmer obscures some members from seeing the rot within. We have, with this document, criticised the political evolution of the past few years. But we want to make one thing very clear: this is nothing new. How far back this goes back is a mystery, since we don't have enough material to come to a grounded conclusion. Our hypothesis is that this ideological rot first emerged in 1974, when members of the Party and the youth wing were excluded for being too left wing. The party obviously can't handle criticism coming from the inside, and have for several decades practiced opposite of what Lenin spoke of, *unity in thought*. Today, we can even argue that K prioritises unity in thought over unity in action - just look at K-Växjö and K-Malmö, and how their line differs regarding muslim calls to prayer.

The organisation haven't been able to (and haven't wanted to) develop since the 1970's, and are desperately clinging to the glory days. Instead of adapting revolutionary tactics and strategy to the current circumstances, they want to change the world to fit their tactics. This is not a story about individuals in positions of power dragging the party towards ruin, it's something that is built into the party itself, and its history. Its conservative unwillingness to apply revolutionary theory, in its hopes that it can apply the circumstances which led to victory in other countries. When that didn't work, the party abandoned marxist thought and instead turned to social democracy. Now, nationalism is on the rise. This is not new. This is a part of a long process, and this is only the latest development. For us, it wouldn't be even slightly surprised if K were to abandon this tactical nationalism for something new - this wouldn't get rid of the underlying problems in the party: the opportunism, the top-rule, the bureaucratism, the elitism, the anti-intellectualism, and the sect-like group mentality that quickly smothers every notion of criticism.

We don't think that the Communist Party will ever lead the working class towards revolution in Sweden. We don't even think that the party wants to. We think that the leadership in K want to enter the parliament in their struggle for more power, just like the Social Democrats. Just like the Social Democrats, the Communist Party is a movement that suffers from internal repression, it is a quiet

and neutered movement, a movement that slowly rots. It has been said that K belongs in a museum. We respectfully disagree, instead arguing that they, like all reformists, revisionists and opportunists, belong on the trash heap of history.

The Communist Party is no longer a revolutionary party, but a revisionist party, dominated by class traitors, and traitors towards socialism. RKU is not an organisation for youths who intend to crush the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, replacing it with the dictatorship of the proletariat. RKU is a top-down managed organisation, held on a tight leash by the revisionist K. Loyalty to marxism therefore compels us to publicly criticise and denounce the leadership of these organisations.

We urge all members of RKU and K that are still loyal towards the revolution to openly criticise the party, and leave the already sinking ship that it is. Refuse their repression, refuse their censorship, refuse and refute their falsehoods! Bombard the headquarters with criticism!

We urge all organisations and parties! Discontinue all collaboration with the Communist Party in Sweden and Revolutionary Communist Youth! Broad collaborations generally, anti-racist and anti-fascist ones especially.

We urge all revolutionary-minded workers and intellectuals to partake in rebuilding a real revolutionary socialist movement without these revisionists.

With this we can now conclude that there is no communism left in the Communist Party and Revolutionary Communist Youth.

The members of the former RKU-Uppsala
Uppsala, January 2019